




Class BX 5995

Book .0603

384



May - T. Onderdonk
 Bishop of New York.

OBSEQUIES AND OBITUARY NOTICES

OF THE LATE RIGHT REVEREND

Benj. Credwell Onderdonk, D. D.,

BISHOP OF NEW-YORK:

INCLUDING THE SEVERAL

APPLICATIONS FOR THE REMOVAL OF HIS SENTENCE,

AND OTHER DOCUMENTS,

SO ARRANGED AS TO FORM

A CONNECTED HISTORY OF EVENTS,

WITH INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

BY A NEW-YORK CHURCHMAN.



New-York:

PUBLISHED BY H. B. PRICE.

884 BROADWAY.

1862.



BX 5995
. 0603

In ~~Box~~
Columbia Univ. Lib.

"FOR MINE HONOUR, I AM WELL ASSURED THAT AS MINE INNOCENCY IS CLEAR BEFORE GOD IN POINT OF ANY CALUMNIES THEY OBJECT; SO MY REPUTATION SHALL, LIKE THE SUN (AFTER OWLS AND BATS HAVE HAD THEIR FREEDOM IN THE NIGHT AND DARKER TIMES), RISE AND RECOVER ITSELF TO SUCH A DEGREE OF SPLENDOUR, AS THOSE FERAL BIRDS SHALL BE GRIEVED TO BEHOLD, AND UNABLE TO BEAR."

ΕΙΚΩΝ ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ.

THE RIGHT REVEREND

Benjamin Credwell Onderdonk, D. D.,

Bishop of New-York.

BORN, JULY 15, 1791,

DEPARTED THIS LIFE, APRIL 30TH 1861.

Contents.

	PAGE.
INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	7
OBITUARY NOTICES.....	17
Death of the Bishop of New-York (<i>Churchman</i>).....	17
Do. do. do. (<i>Church Journal</i>).....	21
Death of Bishop Onderdonk (<i>Churchman's Monthly</i>).....	24
Bishop Onderdonk's Funeral (<i>Express</i>).....	29
OBSEQUIES OF THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP ONDERDONK....	32
Preliminary Meeting of the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese.....	32
The Funeral at Trinity Church.	34
Resolutions of the Standing Committee.....	36
Resolutions of the Faculty of the General Theological Seminary	36
TRIBUTES TO THE MEMORY OF BISHOP ONDERDONK....	40
Resolutions of Standing Committee of General Theological Seminary.....	40
Resolutions of Board of Trustees of General Theological Seminary.....	41
Resolutions of the New-York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society.....	41
Resolutions of the New-York P. E. Tract Society.....	42
Resolutions of Students of General Theological Seminary.....	43
Tribute of the Bishop of Illinois.....	44
Bishop Onderdonk (<i>Poetry</i>)	45

THE CRUSADE AGAINST THE BISHOP OF NEW-YORK.

BISHOP McILVAINE'S LETTER.....	47
BISHOP ONDERDONK'S REPLY.....	49
THE DIOCESAN CONVENTION OF 1843	51
PASTORAL LETTER IN RELATION TO THE ORDINATION OF THE REV. ARTHUR CAREY.....	53
PASTORAL LETTER TO THE LAITY; occasioned by a recent Appeal to them by some of their number.....	59
LETTER OF THE LAITY TO BISHOP ONDERDONK.....	63
REPLY OF BISHOP ONDERDONK TO THE ABOVE	65
PASTORAL LETTER ON THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1844.....	70
TREATMENT OF BISHOP ONDERDONK IN THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.....	71
CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRESENTERS AND BISHOP ON- DERDONK	72
Letter of the Presenters.....	72
Bishop Onderdonk's Remarks.....	74
Bishop Onderdonk's Reply to the Presenters	75

CONTENTS.

V

	PAGE.
PASTORAL LETTER ON THE PRESENTMENT.....	78
VERDICT OF MAJORITY OF COURT.....	78
BISHOP CHASE'S HOSTILITY TO BISHOP ONDERDONK. [NOTE.].....	79
BISHOP ONDERDONK'S SOLEMN PROTEST.....	80
ACTUAL VOTES OF THE COURT UPON THE SENTENCE.....	82
ANALYSIS OF THE VOTES.....	84
BISHOP DOANE ON THE VOTE FOR ADMONITION.....	85
Do. do ON THE VOTE FOR SUSPENSION.....	85
DR. SEABURY ON THE SENTENCE.....	85
Official Sentence.....	87
THE <i>BANNER OF THE CROSS</i> ASSERTS THE ENTIRE INNOCENCE OF THE BISHOP.....	88
THE <i>BUFFALO COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER</i> ON THE TRIAL... ..	89
THE BISHOP'S REITERATION OF HIS ENTIRE INNOCENCE.....	90
THE SMOTHERED CANON.....	91
 FIRST MOVEMENT FOR THE RESTORATION OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.....	96
BISHOP ONDERDONK'S LETTER TO THE BISHOPS.....	96
BISHOP ONDERDONK'S FIRST MEMORIAL.....	97
REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BISHOP ONDERDONK'S MEMORIAL....	99
RESOLUTIONS OF THE NEW-YORK CONVENTION OF 1847.....	102
PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1847.....	102
 SECOND MOVEMENT FOR THE RESTORATION OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.....	107
PRELIMINARY MEASURES.....	107
THE PRAYER OF THE DIOCESE OF NEW-YORK.....	108
REPLY OF THE BISHOPS.....	118
ACTION OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1850.....	120
 PROPOSED CIVIL SUIT.....	21
LETTER FROM BISHOP ONDERDONK.....	123
REPLY.....	124
 LAST MOVEMENT FOR THE RESTORATION OF BISHOP ON- DERDONK.....	126
PRELIMINARY MEASURES.....	126
BISHOP ONDERDONK'S MEMORIAL.....	127
Bishop Onderdonk's Letter to Bishop Potter.....	129
Bishop Potter's Letter to Dr. Tyng.....	130
Bishop Onderdonk's first Letter to the Rev. Drs. Hawks, Tyng, and Eigen- brodt.....	131
Reply to the above.....	132
Bishop Onderdonk's second Letter to the Rev. Drs. Hawks, Tyng, and Eigen- brodt.....	133
Bishop Onderdonk's first Letter to the Rev. Dr. Vinton.....	133
THE MOVEMENT AT MEETING OF THE DIOCESAN CONVENTION OF 1859.....	134
Bishop Potter's Speech.....	136
The Vote on Restoration.....	139

	PAGE.
THE DOINGS OF THE NEW-YORK DELEGATION.....	141
Bishop Onderdonk's second Letter to the Rev. Dr. Vinton.....	141
Memorial of the Church of the Annunciation, New-York.....	142
ACTION OF THE BISHOPS.....	144
The Vote on Unconditional Restoration.....	145
Resolutions of Bishop Whitehouse.....	146
Bishop Onderdonk's Telegram to the Rev. Dr. Vinton.....	147
Bishop Onderdonk's Letter to the Rev. Dr. Vinton, on Resignation of Jurisdiction.....	147
Final Vote on the Case.....	148

APPENDIX.

THE CAREY CASE.....	152
Account of the Ordination.....	153
Remarks.....	155
To the Church.....	156
Rev. Dr. Higbee on the Special Examination.....	157
Subsequent Events.....	159
OUTSIDE INFLUENCES AGAINST BISHOP ONDERDONK'S RESTORATION.....	160
DR. ANTHON ON RESTORATION.....	161
THE DIOCESAN CONVENTION OF 1859 AND BISHOP ONDERDONK..	163
BISHOP ONDERDONK AND SECRET SESSIONS.....	165
OMISSION OF BISHOP ONDERDONK'S NAME FROM CONVENTION JOURNALS.....	168
BISHOP ONDERDONK RE-ASSERTS HIS ENTIRE INNOCENCE ON HIS DEATHBED.....	171
FUNERAL SERMON.....	173

Introductory Remarks.

[The following pages were prepared for the press soon after the death of BISHOP ONDERDONK, but their publication was delayed in order to afford time for the execution of the FINE STEEL ENGRAVING herewith presented, from an Imperial Photograph by Brady, taken about the time of the last General Convention. This being only two years ago, and the likeness an excellent one, the friends of the venerable prelate cannot fail to realize, as they gaze upon it, the genial influences of his life and conversation.]

THE unprecedented sentence inflicted in the early part of the year 1845 upon the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., Bishop of New-York, has at length been terminated—death having put an end both to the hopes of his friends and the fears of his persecutors. The rightful shepherd of the flock no longer laments the hardness of his fate. The GOD whom he continually served has called him from the sphere of the Church Militant, where he was prevented from exercising his lawful commission by the unjust and cruel judgment of an earthly tribunal, and has mercifully placed him beyond the reach of its relentless power, in the Church Triumphant. And, now that the strife is over, the writer, in view of all the facts connected with the official life of Bishop Onderdonk, presents this publication as a humble tribute of his own respect and admiration for the deceased, presuming that it will also be acceptable to his other long tried personal friends.

The selections embrace editorials from Church papers and the secular press; and other matters bearing upon the memorable demonstrations of sympathy and regard, so powerfully manifested at the time of his death, not only by those who have been unwavering in their convictions of the innocence and purity of the Bishop's character, but also by his old foes and persecutors, who, relenting and subdued, seemed every way ready to do justice to the *memory*, at least, of him who

had so long and so recently been the object of their ill-will and reproach.

The obituary notice which appeared in the *Church Journal*, is also assigned a place in this publication, and, but for a single important error therein contained, we should have been pleased to let it pass without special remark. The reader is referred to what the Editor has to say concerning Church Discipline, as connected with the case of Bishop Onderdonk. To dignify the most remarkable persecution, on the part of the Bishops* of the Church, with the name of Discipline, even though such persecution received the solemn sanction of an ecclesiastical tribunal from which there was no appeal, a tribunal which may at any time be organized for the most unhallowed designs, as, indeed, has already happened in each of the cases for which it has been used, is not rightly to distinguish between Episcopal tyranny and Church Discipline. If the Editor of the *Journal* really had "no idea of re-opening the issues which so long divided Churchmen in this and other Dioceses," why was it desirable and proper to assert, as he did substantially, that the fact that the strongest and most beloved and popular Bishop of the strongest Diocese was put down and held in a suspended condition for more than sixteen years,—and that, too, against the unanimous voice of his own Diocese and sundry other overwhelming considerations,—"*thoroughly proves the strength of the Church for administering Discipline—a strength which commands the unbounded confidence of Churchmen and of all reflecting men*?"†

* It should be understood that whenever we speak of the action of the House or Court of Bishops as a body, we are not unmindful of the friendly action of the minority. Especially do we remember the noble stand originally taken by those who represented the votes cast for Admonition, namely: Bishops Whittingham, Doane, De Lancey, Gadsden, Ives, and Kemper. Being compelled by Canon to vote, they pronounced in favor of Admonition, though holding the Respondent "*Not guilty*" of the charges preferred. After which they voted for Suspension to save him from Deposition, when they were roundly abused by the friends of the majority for their *inconsistency* in not suffering him to be Deposed!

† This view of Church Discipline is quite on a par with the *Journal's* opinion as to what constitutes a General Seminary; an opinion which was most approvingly copied by the *Southern Churchman*, namely:

"A Seminary to be *general*, in the sense of educating all candidates, ought to satisfy all parties in the Church, and yet be neither High Church nor Low Church in any sense that could possibly offend the scruples of any advocate of either of the two sections!"

But does not the so-called "Church Discipline" rather prove the well organized character of the conspiracy against the late Bishop of New-York, seeing that no such Discipline could ever have been administered, but for the enactment of Canons, which the General Convention thought best to modify and revoke at the earliest moment after their object was attained, and their alarming intent discovered? And, because the feelings of a majority of the members of the Court, did not prompt them to restore to the individual the powers of which he had thus been deprived, but impelled them to treat every application for his relief with indifference and contempt, are we to look upon the high-handed procedure with "admiration," and to believe that it was the arm of the Omnipotent making itself felt through the Discipline of the Church? Because the Bishops saw fit to regard the action of an *irresponsible* Ecclesiastical Court as INFALLIBLE, and on this ground to declare that the prayer of the Right Rev. Petitioner could not be seriously heard, without a full and unqualified acknowledgment that he was actually guilty of the charges for which he was tried and condemned, are we to be asked to see in all this the remotest glimmering of Christian love—the slightest approximation to that Spirit of Christ, without which there can be no basis for any such Church Discipline as should "command the admiration of all reflecting men?" Is it indeed a proof of the moral force of our Discipline, that a powerful man may be crushed at any time, whilst the weak and imbecile, and a mischievous band of slandering gossips, and conspirators, and plotters against the most sacred rights and privileges of the unsuspecting Christian citizen and Bishop, are absolutely encouraged in their unrighteous doings by prelates of the Church—no notice whatever being taken of the higher offences, whilst those of an ordinary nature, receive attention only in the ratio of about one to a hundred, and that one, perhaps, the case of some poor, friendless clergyman, who needs the sympathy of his brethren infinitely more than he does the so-called "Discipline" of the Church? Why did not the Editor of the *Journal* go further, and propose the Canonization of the Rev. Paul Trapier, that pliant tool of the con-

spirators, who always deemed it his solemn duty to assist in carrying out every evil design against Bishop Onderdonk ; and who, upon the private assurance of Bishop Elliott, that "there were Bishops who would receive affidavits," at once proceeded to arrange with Mr. Memminger for the production of such as would lay the foundation for a Presentment against the Bishop of New-York? Why, it may justly be asked, was not Mr. Trapier proposed for Canonization, as well as his colleague, Mr. Memminger, the accomplished and popular counsel to the original receivers of scandal—he, who, at the suggestion of Mr. Trapier, accepted the commission of hunting up charges in New-York against Bishop Onderdonk,—Mr. Trapier being somewhat inexperienced, and the business rather more in the line of Mr. Memminger? The Editor of the *Journal* must see, that if the case of Bishop Onderdonk may be used to illustrate the strength of Church Discipline, these gentlemen played a very important part in the administration of such Discipline.

The crying evil in the American Church, is the *weakness* of its Discipline. Hence its latitudinarian tendencies. And, with such men as Bishop McIlvaine, and the late Rev. Dr. Anthon, Mr. C. G. Memminger, Mr. John Jay, and the Rev. Messrs. Paul Trapier, James C. Richmond, and C. M. Butler, D. D., as instruments for manufacturing and hunting up slanderous rumors, and the timely aid of Bishops Meade, Elliott, and Otey to investigate, sift, and reduce them to the form of affidavits, it is hard to say who could escape, if once pointed out as an object of persecution or assault by the party that claims their allegiance.

To give a solitary instance of the recklessness with which the minds of witnesses were worked up in the manufacture of testimony, take the case of one of the gentlemen above-named, the Rev. Dr. Butler, now of Washington City, who made a solemn oath to a statement as having been communicated to him by his wife, but which she subsequently declared, under oath, that she did *not* communicate to him or to any other person, and that *no such thing had ever happened!* Startling as this may be, it is nevertheless true; and but for this

false affidavit, and one or two outrageous allegations which the investigating Bishops coolly informed Bishop Onderdonk were "entirely groundless," the presentment against him would not have been made. His enemies, however, knew full well that such things, if once circulated, would produce their desired effect on the public mind. But read what Bishop Onderdonk says on this subject, in the following extract from his "Statement of Facts" connected with the Trial, and published immediately after it—a statement which ought to be in the hands of every true friend of the Church. The letter from which the extract is taken, and which will be found on page 75, was written by Bishop Onderdonk in reply to one from Bishops Meade, Elliott, and Otey, on the 5th of November, 1844, informing him, that they had concluded to present him for trial :*

"You have had your ears open to all the gossip and scandal which men, reducing themselves to the low caste of informers and panders, could seek out and scrape together for the use of my inveterate enemies. It being thus known that there were Bishops here who made it their business to receive, examine, and sift such testimony, has done more to bring scandal on the Church, than all else connected with this business, and has given an intensity of malignant effect to men desperately set upon my ruin. *You have thus been the means of creating the PUBLIC REMOR, which is, I understand, an assumed ground of action for the defence and purifying of the Church.* Thus you have contributed to make me, and through me, our Office, our Church, and our Religion, a scoffing to the profane; and done not a little to aggravate my wretchedness, and help the purpose of my enemies to bring on my ruin. Contrast with all this, what you say of friendly and Christian feelings toward me."

When it is considered that these remarkable words were penned by a Bishop of the Holy Catholic Church in his own defence, and that they were addressed to no less than three of his brethren in the Episcopate, by one who never allowed himself to speak a word of censure or reproach against the humblest individual, unless actuated by the sternest sense of duty, they become invested with all the force and significance that can possibly attach to human utterance. Full sixteen years having passed away since this humiliating paragraph

* It is gratifying to know that Bishop Otey has done so much to atone for this great error of his life, as seems to be indicated by the fact that he voted, on the last Memorial of Bishop Onderdonk, for his *unconditional restoration*.

appeared, none but the older members of the present generation of Churchmen can be supposed to have any distinct idea of the grievances which demanded its publication, or of the spirit that distinguished the prosecution. The disappearance and suppression of similar facts and circumstances connected with the case of Bishop Onderdonk seems, therefore, to require that such of the principal papers and documents as may still be accessible, should be collected and preserved in the present convenient form. For this reason we shall reprint the Memorial of the Bishop presented to the General Convention of 1847, with the extraordinary action thereon, and the Petition of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New-York addressed to the Bishops in 1850.

The last Memorial of Bishop Onderdonk to his Right Reverend Peers, assembled in General Convention in the year 1859, with a connected account of the circumstances attending its presentation, as well as another never before published, from the Church of the Annunciation, are also given entire, together with the Resolution of the Diocese of New-York, asking for the remission of his sentence. These documents were carefully excluded from the records of the Church—not the slightest mention being made of them in the Journal of the House of Bishops, as published in the proceedings of the Convention. The ruling of these papers out of the published proceedings, was an unjustifiable procedure. The right of petition on the part of the Diocese was thus most offensively ignored; and that, too, without even a protest from the Provisional Bishop, who was specially bound by his own declaration to the Convention, to protect the honor and dignity of the Diocese! This concealment of the important fact, that the Diocese of New-York had itself petitioned for the restoration of its rightful Diocesan to the exercise of his Ministerial functions, must either be regarded as one of the evils growing out of the Secret Sessions of the House of Bishops, or as an exemplification of those remorseless attempts on the part of his enemies in the Diocesan Convention, to reduce the name, at least, of the afflicted and helpless Bishop of the Diocese, below the level of the Provisional standard. It is hoped that both

these interesting subjects, which will be found partially ventilated in the selections we have made from *The Churchman*, will receive the attention they merit at the hands of the Ecclesiastical bodies to which they respectively relate. But, whatever action may be taken by the General Convention, whether in relation to closed doors, or the disregard of Diocesan rights on the part of the Upper House, the Annual Convention of the Diocese of New-York should, before the meeting of the next General Convention, record its conviction of the entire innocence of Bishop Onderdonk, and solemnly protest against the injury which has been inflicted upon it by the Court of Bishops, as well by the unjust suspension of its Bishop, as by the persistent and painful indifference to every application for redress or relief.

The valuable letter of the Rev. Dr. Francis Vinton, in relation to his last interview with the Bishop, is likewise inserted in this publication.

As Bishop Onderdonk died protesting his innocence of the charges for which he was condemned, and as the unbending integrity of his life, and deep-toned piety of his declining years, have given to that protest the weight of an established fact, it seems most fitting that the following candid confession of the *Southern Churchman*, that well-known receptacle of all that was violent and unscrupulous in its opposition to the late Bishop of New-York, should here find a place, as an illustration of the force of the Bishop's dying words. Speaking of Bishop Onderdonk: "*We admit*," says this organ of the Puritan party in the Church, "*that his recommendation of the 'Tracts for the Times,' and the Ordination of Mr. Carey, and, perhaps, more than all, his arbitrary and unjustifiable conduct at the close of the New-York Convention of 1843,* proved the occasion of his Trial.*"

* Allusion is here made to the time when Bishop Onderdonk denied the right of any member of the Convention to enter a protest against a portion of the Episcopal Address, on which occasion he uttered the following remarkable words:—

"I sit here in the double right of President of the Convention and Bishop of the Diocese. I will never allow a paper of this character to come before this House, or to go on the Journal of its proceedings. I shall be happy to receive any communication which the clergy or laity of my diocese may hand to me in my individual capacity, but I cannot allow such a document as has just been read, to go upon the Minutes, or be made a matter of discussion. The Standing Committee are my only legal advisers, and their counsel I shall always be happy to receive. In support of this decision, I throw myself upon the Convention—upon both the clergy and laity of my Diocese, and if they fail to sustain me, I throw myself upon a Higher Power, and will yield the principle only with my life."

It will be seen, by reference to the proceedings of the Diocesan Convention of 1859, respecting the restoration of its Bishop, that the Churchmen of New-York had manifold and cogent reasons for looking with confidence to the House of Bishops for a favorable response to the touching Memorial, at that time presented by the Bishop, for the removal of the sentence of suspension. But they were sadly disappointed. A majority of the Bishops, instead of manfully meting out justice to the Diocese of New-York, and showing that they loved mercy by extending that boon to the aged and pious Bishop, suffered themselves to be controlled by influences brought to bear upon them personally, and by outside conversations, as well as by anonymous pamphlets, understood to be issued by authority of the late Rev. Dr. Anthon, and a certain rector of one of our city churches, who, in the prosecution of his ambitious designs, is only saved from absolute obscurity by the intensity of a conceit which sometimes renders him notorious; and whose vulgar harangue on the floor of the Diocesan Convention, in 1859, may still be remembered. But neither outside influence nor anonymous pamphlets could have prevailed against the wishes of the Provisional Bishop. Had he been alive to the responsibility assumed by him at the meeting of the Diocesan Convention, the action of the Bishops would not have resulted unfavorably to the Memorialist. Bishop Potter, it will be remembered, had solemnly said to the Convention of the Diocese, in 1859, when he saw that its members were determined on the restoration of their Bishop, "If I go to Richmond, you will find in me no enemy," thereby leading the friends of the Bishop to suppose that he would do all in his power to favor the resolution of the Convention, as finally adjusted and adopted—such resolution having been freed from all objection, and made satisfactory to him, personally, as he then took occasion to remark. And yet, when called upon at Richmond for his vote by the Council of Bishops, he requested to be excused—thus absolutely declining to express even a desire for the restoration of the Bishop, notwithstanding it was well understood that a majority of the Council would have yielded to the Resolu-

tion of the Diocese of New-York, had the Provisional Bishop intimated that such Resolution was agreeable to him. It need scarcely be added, that the stand taken by Bishop Potter on this occasion, was not only regarded as an unmistakable indication that the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk would be unsatisfactory to him, but *it gave the DEATH-BLOW at once to the Memorialist and his application.* Had the Council disregarded the feelings of the Provisional Bishop and acted upon that universally approved maxim—

“Fiat justitia ruat cælum,”

a much longer time might have elapsed before he could have reached his present position, as the Bishop of the Diocese of New-York.

The fact that the House of Bishops were thus influenced against the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, serves but to increase its condemnation, and to let down its dignity, in the eyes of the Church Catholic, as a judicial tribunal.

Of the authors of the incendiary documents we shall say but little. The city rector must, ere this, if not ashamed of his speech, be heartily disgusted with his pamphleteering adventure. We should so judge, at any rate, from the fact that his name is given as an attendant at the recent funeral of the lamented Bishop. The Rev. Dr. Anthon, whose name is, unfortunately, so connected with these remarks, that we know not how to pass it over in silence, departed this life but a few months before Bishop Onderdonk. Others implicated in the Crusade against the Diocese of New-York, partly from a desire to check the rapid progress of Church principles, but chiefly from personal ill-will to its Bishop, who, in the defence and maintenance of those principles, had often incurred their animosity, have also gone to their long home; and, it is but just and proper to conclude, that had not feelings of personal resentment guided the prosecution against Bishop Onderdonk, the Diocese of New-York, instead of being placed for sixteen years in a crippled and anomalous position, would have been a model to the Church in America, and a light to the Church throughout the world; nor should we now be deploing the loss of our Bishop.

But the history of the suspension of the Bishop of New-York is yet to be written ; and it remains to be discovered how nearly identical is the so-called evangelical spirit that pursued him, with that which animated the Bishop of Vermont and his inquisitorial friends, when he, as their mouth-piece, penned his celebrated proposition for an Ecclesiastical censorship of the press, as the only reliable antidote to those distinctive principles of the Church which, by his Ordination and Consecration vows, he had solemnly sworn to defend !

In the preparation of the following pages, we have availed ourselves of the most authentic sources of information ; and, in relation to what may be termed the Secret History of the case, we have spared no pains to make it as reliable as that which has been gathered from the printed documents. The important character of the undertaking has led us beyond the limits at first prescribed, and thereby enabled us to render the chain of events more complete than was originally intended.

Obituary Notices.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF NEW-YORK.*

THE Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D.D., LL.D., Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, departed this life on last Tuesday morning (April 30th), at 10 o'clock, in the 70th year of his age, after an illness of some months, which he bore with characteristic meekness and resignation. Prayer was offered up for him last Sunday in most of the churches of this city—so that the final event was not wholly unexpected. The Bishop retained the full possession of all his faculties to the latest hour of his life. The Blessed Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ was administered to him and his family on Sunday last (April 28th), by the Rev. Dr. Seabury, the Rector of the Church of the Annunciation, with which the Bishop had been connected as a regular worshipper ever since the day of his unjust and illegal sentence.

Much has been said of the coolness of the Provisional Bishop towards the Diocesan since the last meeting of the General Convention, he having not seen him since that time until the day before his death. This we cannot believe; but, if true, it need not occasion surprise, as it should not be expected that he who had been deputed by the Convention of the Diocese, to plead the cause of its afflicted Diocesan, could, after disparaging that cause by failing to advocate it, whether accidentally or not, find much congeniality of feeling in subsequent association with the disheartened Prelate. Since Bishop Potter, by the Canon which provided for his election, now becomes the Bishop of New-York, there will, doubtless, be an energetic move-

* From *The Churchman* of May 2, 1861.

ment at the next Annual Convention to divide this Diocese, in accordance with the well-known sentiments of the late Bishop Onderdonk.

The Bishop had been gradually declining in health for more than a year—his illness at length assuming the form of a dropsical affection of the chest, superinduced by mental anxiety, arising, unquestionably, from the cruel treatment he received at the hands of a majority of his Episcopal brethren at the meeting of the General Convention in 1859, when the last lingering hope of restoration to the duties of his office was extinguished by the reckless and unjustifiable determination of the House of Bishops to resist every application for his relief, even though such application be based, as the one at that time was, upon the unanimous voice of the Diocese! Advanced in years, sinking under his trials and afflictions, and sighing for the privilege to exercise his ministerial functions, his human nature was unable to endure the shock of the adverse decision, and, from that moment, every one familiar with him seemed to realize the fact that his heart was broken and his spirit crushed, so that a fitting epitaph for his tomb might be —“Here lies the once powerful, most amiable, and much beloved Bishop of New-York, who, instead of being allowed to die a natural death, was, after sixteen years of bitter persecution, literally *crushed out of existence* by the House of Bishops of the American Church, regardless alike of the precepts of the Gospel and even of the common impulses of the unrenewed heart.”

Bishop Onderdonk was born in the City of New-York, in July, 1791. In the year 1806, at the age of fifteen, he entered Columbia College, at which institution he afterwards graduated. In 1812, soon after having completed his twenty-first year, he was ordained Deacon by Bishop Hobart; about two years after which he was admitted to the Holy Order of the Priesthood, at Newark, New-Jersey, by the same friendly hands. In 1814, while yet in Deacon's Orders, he was elected an Assistant Minister of Trinity Church; and in 1816, he succeeded the Rev. Dr. Lyell as Secretary of the Diocesan Convention, holding the office until October, 1830, a period of about fourteen years, when he was elected Bishop of New-York—scarcely one month after the Diocese had become vacant by the death of Bishop Hobart. It is presumed that the fact that this Prelate had, sometime before his death, expressed a desire that Bishop Onderdonk should succeed him in the administration of the Diocese, contributed materially to such a result. The other candidates for the office, Drs. Anthon and Wainwright, were scarcely noticed at the time of the election, the former

receiving but six votes, and the latter only a few more ; whereupon the Convention passed a resolution declaring Dr. Onderdonk to be the unanimous choice of the Convention.

He was consecrated at S. John's Chapel, in this city, on the 26th of November of the same year, about four weeks after his election. The Prelates who officiated at his Consecration, were Bishops White, Brownell, and Henry U. Onderdonk. He was chosen Bishop of New-York with the understanding that his connection with Trinity Church should be severed, and his time exclusively devoted to the affairs of the Diocese. But, owing to the inadequacy of the Episcopal Fund to the necessary expenses of such a position, he continued in connection with the Parish until about the time of the division of the Diocese, when, by the munificence of Trinity Church, the provision for exclusive work was made ample by the increase of the Fund.

It may not be uninteresting to those who remember the exciting scenes of the Annual Convention of 1843, immediately after the Ordination of Mr. Carey, when Bishop Onderdonk was compelled to resist the measures of ambitious and designing men, attempting to degrade the character of the Episcopate by passing public censure upon that portion of his Address which endorsed the course of *The Churchman*, to know that the sublime demonstration then made by him, in achieving that memorable victory over the enemies of the Church of Christ, did not arise from any inordinate love of Episcopal power and rule. Such a conclusion would be utterly at variance with the fact that Bishop Onderdonk was never known to utter a syllable of dissatisfaction at the proposal to divide this Diocese. On the contrary, he looked with such particular favor upon the measure, that many persons concede to him the absolute origin of the proposition. He loved order above all things in legislative councils, and God had blessed him with transcendent administrative ability to secure it. For this, and his matchless devotion to, and support of, the distinctive principles of the Church, he was maligned and persecuted ; for these he was falsely accused, tried, and fraudulently deprived of his right to exercise the functions of his office ; and, from servile dread of the further exercise of a power, every way important to the best interests of society and the Church, the iniquity of professing Christians bound him in chains to the day of his death.

Bishop Onderdonk was unwearied in the use of his pen, ever boldly asserting and defending his views. As an able and forcible writer and strong thinker, he has left many valuable contributions to

the literature of the Church, not the least of which may be found scattered through the columns of this journal.

He took a deep and abiding interest in the affairs of the General Theological Seminary, having been a Professor therein ever since its establishment in this city, and, if we mistake not, was one of the first Professors in the original institution, looking closely after its interests throughout all the changes of its peculiar history—almost entirely without pecuniary reward. And yet, who would believe that a great hue and cry was raised by his persecutors because a few earnest-minded and fearless students followed him into his retirement, to receive his godly counsel and instruction concerning the “Nature, Ministry, and Polity of the Church?”

The decease of Bishop Onderdonk has filled the minds of Churchmen with gloom, and startled all classes of the people. Every man is interested in the event. The community feels that a great wrong has been done to an eminent Bishop of the Church, and begins to realize the danger to society of the unrestrained exercise of ecclesiastical power by a Court of Bishops, who, while praying in the language of a formulary whose principles they have solemnly sworn to illustrate and enforce, that God would “raise up those who fall,” deliberately declare to the world that their vengeance can only be satisfied by keeping alive the fires of persecution, until the head of their victim is bowed in death! But especially among Churchmen has a strong reaction of feeling taken place concerning the trial and sentence of Bishop Onderdonk, ever since the House of Bishops put its iron heel upon the neck of the Diocese of New-York, by resolutely opposing its unanimous desire for the restoration of its Bishop. Such a reaction occurring in State affairs, in behalf of an injured official, would secure perpetual infamy and disgrace to every conspirator in the original plot. We may say, however, in this connection, that a large majority of Churchmen, in this Diocese and throughout the country, have ever firmly asserted and maintained the entire innocence of the Bishop.

But enough. Rest, dear old Bishop, rest, within thy peaceful tomb, where no false friend or open enemy will ever venture to dispute thy claim. And, as often as we allude to “the Noble Army of Martyrs” who praise the living God, we will think of thee, for thou wast indeed a martyr, and wilt not be denied a martyr’s crown!

“Eternal rest give unto him, O Lord :
And let perpetual light shine upon him.”

[From the *Church Journal* of May 1, 1861.]

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF NEW-YORK.

AFTER the announcement of the grievous illness of the Bishop of the Diocese, our readers will scarcely be surprised, though they will be deeply grieved, to learn that he is no more. On Sunday he received the Holy Communion for the last time from the hands of the Rev. Dr. Seabury, to whose Parish he had attached himself for more than sixteen years. During Monday he failed rapidly; and on Tuesday morning, at about 11 o'clock, he calmly and peacefully departed, retaining his consciousness almost to the last moment. At the earnest request of many of the city clergy, the funeral has been fixed for Tuesday of next week, in order to allow full opportunity of attendance on the part of the clergy and laity from remoter portions of the Diocese. No one would willingly be absent on this, the last occasion for manifesting in this world the deep regard and affection entertained towards one who, for very many years, has been so severely tried.

We have no idea of re-opening the issues which, from the close of the year 1844, and for some time after, so hotly and bitterly divided the Churchmen of this and other Dioceses. The strength of the Church for administering discipline was then thoroughly proved, and put to a severer test than it is likely soon to know again. That the Bishop of the strongest, most numerous, and most wealthy Diocese, a leading member of the preponderating party in the Church, one who commanded a very large and enthusiastic majority among both the clergy and the laity of his own Diocese, entrenched in the hearts of his people, supported by a unanimous Standing Committee, and by the almost unanimous voice of his colleagues in every local institution with which he was connected, a man beloved and endeared by his genial temper, his long parochial connection with Trinity Church, his life-time of service among the leading Church families of this city, and last, not least, by his indefatigable labors throughout the Diocese, and his extraordinary powers of business: that a Bishop like this, we say, should be struck down in his own chief city by a Court of his peers, on evidence the conclusiveness of which was loudly denied by his friends; that he should be visited with a sentence which by some high legal names was declared to be null and void, and which left his faithful Diocese in an anomalous position that for a long while deprived it of the benefit of Episcopal oversight and govern-

ment: that, under all these adverse circumstances, the discipline of the Church should have been carried out in the person of her most powerful Bishop; that the sentence should have been submitted to without resistance both by that Bishop and his Diocese; that such a Bishop should have been put down, and kept down, for more than sixteen years, and until the hand of Death—more merciful than the majority of his brethren—released him from the bond: this is surely a degree of *strength* sufficient to command the unbounded confidence of Churchmen, and of all other reflecting men.

As to the Bishop himself, we shall only say that here, in the community in which he lived from birth till death, and where only he was thoroughly well known—here in the Diocese to which he has always belonged, and which has a right to speak of him as none others can—*here*, we say—except, perhaps, in a very few embittered minds—the idea of any such thing as “immorality” or “impurity” in connection with Bishop Onderdonk’s character, has long ago *utterly disappeared*. Even when the tempest was at the fiercest, no charge was brought against him later than three years before his trial; and in presence of the overwhelming testimony given by nearly *twenty years* of a spotless life, even an army of eager accusers must needs stand dumb.

That under the circumstances, many of the Bishop’s friends should have defended him, and attacked those whom they regarded as his bitter personal enemies, with great acerbity, and with much of irritating and unmeasured denunciation, was to be expected, as unavoidable in the present imperfection of human nature. But the Bishop himself never at any time gave utterance to aught inconsistent with Christian charity in regard to those who had acted against him. He did indeed, once and again, address a respectful Memorial to the House of Bishops requesting a restoration to the exercise of his jurisdiction: which Memorials he received permission to withdraw. His restoration was, once and again, requested by the Convention of the Diocese: and yet was not granted. Meanwhile, his own course of life was, from the moment when the dark cloud descended upon him, such as could not fail to win him the solid and enduring regard of even those who might have been doubtful or hostile before. He secluded himself entirely from all appearance in the public eye, unless the anonymous use of his pen in *The Churchman* and the *Churchman’s Monthly* be excepted—an employment in every way congenial to his habits and suitable to his retired position—no hint of his authorship


being given, except occasionally the modest appearance of his initials at the lower corner, and in later years not even that. His life has been spent, during all these long and lonely years, in his library, with his pen and his books. Resisting the entreaties of all his friends, he has gone abroad nowhither ;—nowhither except to the House of God, which has been his *daily* resort. Until his infirmities increased too much upon him, he might be met daily in all weathers, avoiding the main thoroughfares of the city, but wending his way through the quieter streets to the Church of the Annunciation, there to kneel with the few that know how to prize at its true worth the privilege of Daily Prayer. Often have we thus met him on his churchward way, walking with downcast look, as if unwilling to attract attention, and saluting only those who spoke first to him ; but then the salute was returned by him with a genial warmth, tinged with sadness, which went at once to the heart.

Thus year after year passed away, and he yet lived on in the hope that, at last, the oft-defeated and yet growing desire for his restoration might perchance be granted. In every effort made for this end, the movement originated with others, not with him. No matter how earnestly he might desire it, he said no word, he did no act, looking towards such a result, until others approached him on the subject, and urged it upon him as the desire of the Diocese. The last and most promising attempt to secure this long-expected restoration was in 1859, when, after one of the most able and brilliant debates ever known in the Convention of the Diocese, that body requested the Bishop's restoration by a vote so overwhelming that it was hardly possible to believe that it would not prevail with the House of Bishops. The conviction that it would succeed was so strong and universal, the noble stand taken by Dr. Hawks, Dr. Tyng, and Dr. Cutler, with others once reckoned among the Bishop's most energetic opponents, was so striking a proof of the disappearance of former prejudices, and the return of love and confidence, that the whole body of his friends, and the Bishop himself, were filled with a hope which only made disappointment the more bitter when it came. There was no complaint, indeed, from the lips of him who was then drawing near to the appointed limit of threescore years and ten : but the hope that had been firmly planted in his heart through so many years of sorrow and long waiting, now died down, withered to the very root. There was nothing more left on earth to live for. Little by little proof was given that the strength of life was slowly dropping away. There has

been, since then, a gradual and steady increase of infirmities, of one kind or other, until, in February last, they began to assume a serious form, and ere long developed into the accumulation of water on the heart, which at length, though with little of pain or suffering, quenched the spark of life.

We have already said that the Bishop never suffered himself to speak of those who had been his chiefest and bitterest opponents, except in language of kindness and Christian charity. He had done more than this: he had often earnestly rebuked those of his friends, who, in his presence, spoke otherwise. During his last illness, this peculiar proof of a loving heart and a sanctified spirit shone forth with more of purity and strength than ever before. Again and again, when able to converse, did his dying lips give utterance to the beautiful thought that soon he would meet, in the presence of the blessed Jesus, those from whom he had been so unhappily separated here on earth; and he dwelt with the utmost gentleness and loving sweetness upon the thought that *there* all misunderstandings of one another would be removed, all misrepresentations and errors be done away, and that *together* they would be "accepted in the Beloved."

Dear, good old man! Hundreds, aye, thousands, from all parts of the Diocese will soon stand sadly around his clay-cold form, in the Church where for so many years he has worshipped in hope; and their hearts will burn within them to think that the thick cloud was not permitted to lift, nor even one brief gush of sunshine was let in to lighten the evening of his days. But it is vain to wish now for earthly sunshine as any blessing to one who has passed from all sorrows and darkness here—even through the valley and shadow of death—to the seven-fold light of that Heavenly City that needeth no sun to enlighten it, for "The Lord God and the Lamb are the Light thereof."



[From the *Churchman's Monthly Magazine* for June, 1861.]

DEATH OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

WE are called upon to record the decease of the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, who died at his residence, No. 35 West Twenty-seventh street, in the City of New-York, on Tuesday, the 30th day of April, 1861.

Bishop Onderdonk had been suffering for some weeks from water

on the chest, but it was not until a few days before his decease that any immediate danger was apprehended. When his situation was announced to him by his warm and intimate friend, and for years past attached Pastor, the Rev. Dr. Seabury, the intelligence, although unexpected, did not find him unprepared. His reply was, that a Christian man should always be ready to receive the warning, come when it might. He thanked him for conveying the intelligence to him, and stated that it had relieved his mind of a great weight which had pressed upon it, in the possibility that his family might not be prepared for the event. His uniform cheerfulness was not in the least discomposed. On Sunday, between Services, he received with his family, by his own appointment, the Holy Communion, joining in the Services and making the responses in an audible voice. His strength continued to fail until Tuesday morning, when, without a struggle, calmly and tranquilly he resigned his spirit into the keeping of his God and Saviour.

His sickness and death were a complete triumph of the Christian virtues over the weakness of poor, fallen, unassisted humanity. Not a murmur or complaint escaped his lips during his entire illness, but a beautiful and serene cheerfulness took up its abode in his breast, and prompted every word he spoke and every look he gave. All within was love and peace. His only trust was in the merits of his Saviour, but that was firm and unwavering. And he not only trusted in Him, but he took Him as an example. Wronged and injured as he had been, he had only charity and forgiveness for those at whose hands he had suffered so much, and a wish to believe that however they had been misled, they could reconcile their course to their own consciences.

Those whose privilege it was to be with him, both clerical and lay friends, while life was ebbing away, will bear witness that his death was the death of a righteous man, and can ask no higher privilege than that their "last end may be like his."

But however his broad and comprehensive charity, formed in the same mould with that of his Divine Master who had suffered before him, might breathe the spirit of forgiveness even while the storm and tempest were beating upon his head, meekly bowed beneath the stroke, he felt, and the Church in this Diocese and elsewhere feels, that he has been subjected to a grievous wrong. It is, and ever will be, a shame and a reproach to the judicial tribunals of the Church, that men should have consented to sit as his judges, and unite in his condemna-

tion, who had been known for years beforehand to be openly and notoriously inimical to him. It is a shame and reproach that in the face of the fact that six of the members of the Court *entirely acquitted* him of the charge on which he was tried, these men strove with all their might to effect his *deposition*. And when they were foiled in that, and the sentence of *suspension* was passed by those who intended that it should be *temporary*, it is a shame and reproach that these same men should have been the stumbling block in the way of its removal, whenever the attempt to effect relief was made.

The movement against Bishop Onderdonk, as is well known, did not originate in his own Diocese. That was true to him, and stood by him. It was an outside influence, with sinister purposes in view, which allied itself to a few disappointed and restless spirits here to work his downfall. It altogether ignored the Diocese and the rights of the Diocese, which was in effect told that it was not competent to judge whether its Bishop was or was not worthy of his office. It was therefore bidden to stand aside, that purer and holier men outside of the Diocese might discharge the duty for which it was incompetent. Under this Pharisaical plea, the rights of the Diocese and its Bishop were invaded and trampled upon by what we pronounce to be an irresponsible and *lawless assemblage*. And when we say this, we do it upon the authority of the Court of Bishops themselves, in the decision subsequently made by them in the case of the Bishop of New-Jersey. In that case they decided that the authority given to three Bishops to present another for trial, was *conditional*, and could only be exercised where the Diocese, whose Bishop was to be presented, had failed or refused to discharge the duty, which, *in the first instance*, devolved upon it. There was no pretence that the Diocese had proved recreant to its duty, or were unwilling to investigate any charges that might be made. The presentment was therefore void, and the Court, consequently, had no jurisdiction, and was, *as to the trial*, an illegal assemblage, whose judgment was not worth the paper it was written upon. But irresponsible power, when goaded on by the lash of passion and prejudice, is, in the attainment of its object, very apt to bear down or overleap the restraints of law, and there never was a more signal instance of this than in the proceedings instituted and driven on to the bitter end against Bishop Onderdonk.

We have said that the Church in this Diocese had ever been faithful to her Bishop, had never lost her confidence in him. Always a lover of order; always submitting to authority, even when doubting

the wisdom or justice, or even legality of its exercise in the particular case, she yielded obedience to the judgment. But once and again has she knocked at the door of the House of Bishops and petitioned for relief; and once and again has a deaf ear been turned to her prayer, and she been sent remediless away. The last time that she asked for redress was in 1859, and it was in a voice which, though respectful and deferential, was uttered with such overwhelming unanimity that a favorable response was looked for as almost certain. When the fact became known that the great Diocese of New-York had been again spurned, almost with contempt, from the House of Bishops, and that her petition had been denied, there was an almost universal feeling that she, as well as her Bishop, had been humiliated and condemned. That tribunal sits with closed doors. In its judicial capacity it is a secret inquisition, and its doings reach not the ear of the Church at large. Nothing can therefore be said of what transpires within its walls which may be regarded as authoritative. It is known, however, that a number of the Bishops were in favor of meeting the wishes of the Diocese, and restoring its Bishop; while it is strongly asserted that the will of the Diocese, as expressed by its Convention, was not urged upon the House of Bishops, as it should have been, by the one [the Provisional Bishop] whose position made him be regarded, in a measure, as the representative of the Diocese in that body. However this may be, and whatever may have been its influence upon the action of the House of Bishops, the result was, as we have stated, that the request of the Diocese was denied, and the fetters which, with almost uncomplaining fortitude, Bishop Onderdonk had been wearing for fifteen long and weary years, were mercilessly tightened by his relentless judges. Fifteen long and weary years! And which one of those who condemned him, during that age of exile, ever called upon him in his solitude, ever sent him a single line of fraternal admonition, advice, or counsel? Surely, had they believed him guilty, they would, if the Spirit of Christ had dwelt in their hearts, have sought by every means within their power to win him back. But the spirit which prompted his condemnation, dried up and withered in the breasts of his adverse judges all Christian sympathy towards him, and made them neglect, what, according to their own view of his case, was their plain, Christian duty.

But we turn from this dark shadow to a brighter picture. The wrath of man could not take from the Bishop the comfort which a conscience void of offence never fails, even under the most trying afflict-

tions, to bestow. In his retirement he exhibited a uniform cheerfulness and serenity of mind, which attracted the observation of all who were brought in contact with him. This was strengthened and increased by the manifold evidences he experienced of the continued and uninterrupted friendship and confidence of the army of friends by whom he was surrounded. And it is a significant fact, that those who knew him longest, and most intimately, in both his public and private life, who had been with him in the unrestrained intercourse of private friendship, from his youth up, continued strong and unwavering in their friendship to the last, and extended to him their undiminished confidence.

Being a man of large and generous sympathies and open-handed charity, the poor always found in Bishop Onderdonk a friend ready to relieve their wants, and to administer, with the tenderness of a father, that comfort and support so grateful to the bereaved and stricken spirit, when coming from one who can enter into, and feel the sorrows which he seeks to assuage. The poor generally, but especially those faithful and laborious clergy of his Diocese, whose labors were abundant, but whose lives were spent amid privations and discouragements, knew where they could always go for counsel, encouragement, and comfort, and never go in vain. It was these traits which attached his clergy to him so warmly, and made those who knew him best, and were most intimate with him, his strongest and most unshaken friends. It was these traits which, in the last years of his life, led such numbers to seek him in his retirement, to open to him their griefs, to ask for guidance and counsel, amid the difficulties which encompassed them, and enabled them to come forth from his presence comforted and strengthened for the battle of life in which they were engaged. Many a moistened eye has testified to the irreparable loss which such as these have sustained. The death of Bishop Onderdonk cast a gloom upon the Diocese, and the intelligence of his decease touched a spring which caused the feelings of affection, so long pent up, to flow forth in an unrestrained and almost overwhelming outbreak.

Dr. Seabury, in compliance with the unanimous request of the meeting of the day previous, delivered the discourse. It had been felt that he, of all others, was the one upon whom this duty should devolve. From his boyhood to the hour of the death of his Bishop, his relations towards him had been of the most intimate character. For the last sixteen years the Bishop had been a constant, almost

daily attendant at his church. He had administered to him the Communion two days before his decease. He could, therefore, speak as none other could. The Sermon was a noble tribute of love, confidence, and affection, towards one for whom respect and love had grown stronger and deeper as the night of affliction revealed clearer and brighter the heavenly lights which dwelt within his soul. The testimony there borne to his moral purity and integrity, built upon a lifetime of intimate unrestrained intercourse and friendship, did but express the universal sentiment of the vast assemblage then present. The statement that he had never heard him utter a word which might not have been spoken in the presence of the angels of God, was the highest eulogy which could have been pronounced.

* * * * *

After the Services were concluded the lid was removed from the coffin, and an opportunity given to all who might desire it once more to look upon the features of the departed. There was scarcely one in that vast assemblage who did not take a parting farewell. And there is none who will forget the spirit of calm repose which rested upon that countenance. It was as if he had just fallen into a tranquil slumber. The whole expression was that of peace, gentleness, and love. And as the throng gathered around, bent over him, and then sadly passed on, many a tear, fresh from aching hearts, dropped its tribute of affection upon his coffin, upon which were laid flowers wreathed by loving fingers into crosses, crowns, and wreaths; and, in the language of the *Church Journal*, "thousands stood sadly around his clay-cold form, and their hearts burned within them to think that the thick cloud was not permitted to lift, nor even one brief gush of sunshine was let in to lighten the evening of his days."



[From the *New-York Express* of May 8, 1861.]

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S FUNERAL.

FEW more suggestive spectacles have ever been witnessed in New-York than that of yesterday (May 7th), when the funeral solemnities of Bishop Onderdonk were celebrated at Trinity Church, by the clergy and people of what had once been his Diocese. The immense concourse that crowded to pay respect to his memory, that filled the church and overflowed into the church-yard, and into the public streets, the long procession of priests and deacons who joined in the

solemn Services which he whom they commemorated had so often led, contained a signal though tardy tribute to the character of the departed prelate. Tardy, indeed, for many of the men who participated in those Services had contributed to degrade their Bishop—had volunteered to bring a reproach upon him and the branch of the Church of which he was the head; though now repentant in spirit, they united with his life-long friends in exculpating his memory. When the form of the venerable man was brought into that church of which he had formerly been the Minister, and deposited in the chancel where he had once been used to celebrate the highest and holiest rites of religion, but which, of late, he might not enter save as a recipient instead of a ministrant; when he who has held and still holds the place of the injured Bishop appeared as chief mourner, and the people who had been deprived of their Father in God, were allowed to see him before the Altar, it is true, but laid low in death—it was impossible to forget much that many would wish forgotten.

If Bishop Onderdonk was really worthy of the commemoration paid him yesterday by Ministers and Bishops, and by the Diocese, he was also one of the most persecuted and maltreated of men. If he deserved the eulogiums pronounced on him by solemn vote of clergy and laity, then has a noble man been deprived of his just due; a worthy Christian been unjustly maligned; an innocent person visited with the severest punishment. Then has he displayed an example of the most saint-like charity and unprecedented humility; suffering evils the worst that could be inflicted on him, the loss of honor, friends, station, power, good name, and the respect of good men, with a meekness and a patience, a forgiveness of enemies, that have few parallels in history. That after all this, his closing years should provoke even his injurers to join in a demonstration like that of yesterday, celebrating his excellences and bewailing his loss, is one of the most remarkable instances of the power of a good life to live down aspersion and ill-will.

But the old man knew not of this. He had suffered without receiving the solace of a vindication of his name; he had died with a blot on his character. The eulogium had not reached his ear; the commendation assuaged not his spirit. He died solemnly asseverating his innocence, declaring at the most awful hour of his existence, when about to receive the last consolation of that religion which alone could afford him any comfort then—that his conscience acquitted him of the faults of which he had been accused and for which he had been con-

demned. His conscience and the fidelity of some staunch friends were his support during seventeen years. His staff of office was never restored to him, nor the charge of his flock; his heart was broken, and he sank into his grave, the victim—if the doings of yesterday were not an unmeaning mockery—of one of the bitterest and most causeless calamities that have ever fallen on man.

His friend was chosen to deliver his funeral sermon; and poignant as doubtless was the grief of that friend, the service must have been joyfully accepted. The friend who for nearly fifty years had known the Bishop in an intimacy such as exists but seldom between man and man; who had supported him in power, and solaced him in weakness; who had fought his battles and borne his burdens; who had trusted in him always, and, in his turn, never been found wanting; who had ministered to him in holy things when the Bishop himself was debarred from the functions of his office; who had even been permitted to distribute the Sacred Elements to the dying man; the friend who, in all this intimacy, never discovered an indication in word or feeling of the impurity or immorality for which the sufferer was condemned—that friend was selected to pronounce the last public discourse on Bishop Onderdonk's merits and character. The character which could awaken such a profound and tender friendship in a man, towards a man, and keep it alive for nearly half a century—which could prompt and foster such devotion through good report and through evil report—receives in this fact its best encomium, its most successful vindication. The task assigned that friendship was worthily performed; tearfully, but with due deference to the solemnities of the occasion. No attempt was made to revive the flames of smouldering fires—but all justice was done to the memory of him who was on that occasion, for the first time in many years, spoken of as "our Father in God."

But what a comment on human judgments and human justice did this tardy tribute to a dead man's memory inevitably suggest!

Obsequies of the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk.

PRELIMINARY MEETING OF THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF THE DIOCESE.

IN the arrangements for the funeral of the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D.D., Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, it was originally intended that the clergy and friends should meet at the residence of the deceased, and accompany the body to the Church of the Annunciation, where the Bishop had been a daily worshipper from the period of his unjust suspension until his last illness. This arrangement, however, was unsatisfactory to many who felt that it would not afford, by any means, an adequate opportunity to express the long pent-up feelings of the Churchmen of New-York, and Trinity Church claimed it as her right that the Bishop, whose whole parochial ministry had been spent in her Parish, should receive the last Sacred Rites at her Altar. This change occasioned a slight complication in regard to the meeting of the clergy and laity. The Provisional Bishop, who was absent from the city on a visitation at the time of the decease of the Bishop, as soon as information reached him, telegraphed to the city calling a meeting of the clergy at the place where the funeral was to be celebrated, and one hour previous to that named for the commencement of the Service—not knowing that this would call the meeting at the residence of the deceased. When it was determined to hold the funeral at Trinity Church, another call was issued by the venerable rector, the Rev. Dr. Berrian, and a number of the leading clergy of the city. It was responded to on Monday, May 6th, at 3 o'clock P. M., in Trinity Church, where, in the midst of a pouring rain, several hundred of the clergy (some of them from

remote parts of the Diocese), and a large number of the leading laity, assembled to do honor to the departed.* When they arrived, however, they found the Burial Service about to be performed over the remains of the late Mr. Henry I. Seaman—the funeral from some misunderstanding having been appointed at the same hour. At its conclusion, the Right Rev. Bishop Potter arrived, and at the call of the Rev. Dr. Creighton, took the chair, with a few brief remarks, explaining the circumstances detailed above, respecting the change in the arrangements.

The Rev. Dr. Eigenbrodt and the Rev. Dr. Leonard were appointed Secretaries. On the nomination of Dr. Vinton, a Committee was appointed, consisting of the Rev. Drs. Creighton, Seabury, Hawks, Tyng, and Higbee, who retired to prepare Resolutions; and on their return, the following were read by Dr. Hawks, and unanimously adopted:

"WHEREAS, Almighty God, in His All-wise Providence, has been pleased to take away by death, the Right Reverend BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, we, the clergy of the Diocese, desire to render to his memory our appropriate tribute, and, therefore, adopt the following resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That we cheerfully acknowledge the services rendered to the Church of New-York in the discharge of the duties of the Episcopate by our departed Bishop, while in the active exercise of his charge; and heartily thank God for the good which, by his diligent and faithful labors, our heavenly Father permitted and enabled his deceased servant to effect. And we here record our conviction, founded on the personal knowledge of our older clergy, and by their testimony confirmed to us who are their younger brethren, that it would be unjust to say less of him than that he has been excelled by very few who have filled the Episcopal chair in our branch of the Church, in an ardent desire to promote what he deemed her interest and prosperity, in an untiring zeal to aid in her welfare, and in indefatigable labors in the performance of his duties over the most extended Diocese in our country, embracing for several years the entire territory of the State of New-York.

"*Resolved*, That, as, under the circumstances which in the latter portion of his days prevented him from the active discharge of Episcopal duties, and removed him from the observation of the greater part of the clergy, he had personal intercourse with

* The following is a copy of the notice issued:

"The Clergy of the Diocese of New-York are requested to meet in Trinity Church, on Monday, May 6, at 3 o'clock, P. M., to express their respect for the memory of their late Bishop Right Rev. BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK.

"Those of the Laity who shall please to attend the meeting, will be cordially welcomed.

"The funeral of Bishop Onderdonk is appointed on Tuesday, May 7th, at Trinity Church, at 3 o'clock, P. M.

Wm. Berrian,
Francis L. Hawks,
John McVickar,
Benjamin C. Cutler,
Samuel R. Johnson,
Clement C. Moore,

J. H. Hobart,
Morgan Dix,
Samuel H. Turner,
Ed. Y. Higbee,
Francis Vinton,

Samuel Seabury,
Joseph H. Price,
Stephen H. Tyng,
W. G. Eigenbrodt,
Frederick Ogilby,
Theodore A. Eaton."

few, save the attached private friends, who saw him in the seclusion of a sorrowing yet submissive spirit which acquiesced with resignation in God's dispensations; yet does this meeting express its belief, on the uniform testimony of those who communicated with him in his sorrows, that by God's grace he had transmuted adversity into a blessing, and snatched from sorrow itself a Christian solace. We rejoice to think and believe, as we do, that a sanctified affliction but served more strongly to develop in him, and brought out into prominent relief, the Christian virtues of patience, submission, forgiveness, and faith in his Redeemer, beautifully blended with an unobtrusive and modest cheerfulness, which never indulged in complaint, nor uttered words of bitterness and crimination. To the general tenor of his life in his latter days, we all can bear witness, and gladly say that, as a man and a Christian, we do not believe (making all due allowance for the infirmities to which all of us, even the best, are subject) that any one can with truth cast an imputation on his consistent Christian conduct. We rejoice to hear that his closing hours were marked by the calmness and peace of a dying believer, who felt himself sustained by the faith he had in a crucified Saviour; and that at the close of his long and much saddened life, he gently fell asleep in Jesus, and, as we trust, has found repose in the Paradise of God, 'Where the wicked cease from troubling, and where the weary are at rest.'"

This meeting not answering the full end and design for which it was called, several of the leading clergy and laity present, immediately after its adjournment, held an informal meeting in the vestry room of the church, when proper arrangements were made with reference to the funeral solemnities of the following day. At this meeting the Rev. Dr. Vinton was appointed to read the resolutions above given, together with those of the Standing Committee of the Diocese and of the Faculty of the General Theological Seminary, and also to make the statement of the Bishop in his last illness, declaring his innocence of the charges brought against him. The Rev. Dr. Seabury was also appointed to deliver the funeral sermon; but he declined, as he had previously done; yet he was at length prevailed upon to accede to the wishes of his brethren.



THE FUNERAL AT TRINITY CHURCH.*

If anything were needed to convince gainsayers of the unswerving devotion of the Churchmen of New-York to their late Right Rev. Father in God, nothing would have been better suited to such purpose than the sight presented at his funeral in Trinity Church, on Tuesday, May 7th. It was, as has been well observed, the "most imposing demonstration of respect and affection ever rendered to a Bishop in our Church."

* From *The Church Journal*, with slight alterations and additions.

The church, long before the appointed hour, was filled to overflowing, and thousands, many of whom had come from distant parts of the Diocese, were unable to obtain an entrance, and thronged the vestibule, the churchyard, and the sidewalk. A hundred of the clergy in surplices (besides at least as many more in gowns or citizens' dress), entered the great door at three o'clock, and stood on either side of the whole length of the middle aisle. Through this double line the surpliced choristers, officiating clergy, and the Bishops of New-York, Western New-York, and New-Jersey, moved down to the door to meet the body, which, as they returned, was borne after them, on men's shoulders. It was covered with a purple pall, in which was wrought a white Cross; the pall being the same as that used at the funeral of the late Bishop Doane, of New-Jersey. Upon the pall were placed a Cross, a Crown, and a Mitre, composed of camelias, orange flowers, white rosebuds, *Deutzia gracilis*, and white heath. The body was accompanied by the following clergymen as pall-bearers, robed in their gowns and stoles: The Right Rev. Horatio Southgate, D. D., the Rev. Drs. Berrian, Creighton, Brown, Price, Cutler, Hawks, Leonard, Porter, Parker, S. R. Johnson, W. L. Johnson, McVickar, and the Rev. Messrs. Haskins, Mallaby, Gallaudet, Draper, and Duffie.

After the mourners had passed, the double line of surpliced clergy closed in and moved on, followed by the other clergy, the Faculty and students of the General Theological Seminary, the New-York Bible and Common Prayer Book Society, the Protestant Episcopal Tract Society, and other Church Institutions, the procession being closed by the children of Trinity School.

The Altar and reredos were all in black, as was also the Episcopal chair, which stood empty throughout the Service. The whole of the chancel furniture, the lectern, and the pulpit, were draped in black, the gloom being relieved by the candelabra of many wax lights on either side, and one group of lights also on the Altar. For nearly an hour the sky had been overcast with clouds, and some rain had fallen, but as the procession entered the church, the Bishop of Western New-York saying the opening Sentences, the clouds began to clear away. The sanctuary and choir, so dark with their drapery of black, were now filled up with rank on rank of snowy surplices—and when the bearers let down their sacred burden in the choir, the sunlight burst forth clear and strong, pouring its full flood of purple, and crimson, and golden light, through the stained glass windows upon the dead in

the centre of the choir—thence overflowing it bathed all the pavement underneath, and soon silently stole downward towards the pall-bearers, painting their sable robes with splendid hues, and kindling their hoary locks into silver and gold; and by and by, moving further, with broader slant, until it diffused itself among the multitudes of the great congregation.

Meanwhile the voices of the full double choir had begun the anthem, "Lord, let me know my end," which was sung solemnly and slowly. The Lesson was read by the Rev. Dr. Higbee; after which, by request, the Rev. Dr. Francis Vinton read the following preamble and resolutions, unanimously adopted by the Standing Committee of the Diocese on Friday, May 3d:

"WHEREAS, On Tuesday, the 30th day of April, it pleased Almighty God, in His wise Providence, to remove from this earthly scene of trial the Canonical head of our Diocese, the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., Bishop of New-York, it becomes the duty of the Standing Committee to enter on their Minutes an appropriate record of the same; therefore,

"*Resolved*, That such entry now be made, with the following expression of their feelings. Long withdrawn from his official duties, under a judicial sentence, believed by many to be of doubtful validity—that of indefinite suspension—Bishop Onderdonk has been known to the Church for more than sixteen years only through the medium of private intercourse, in the bosom of his family, and in the deep retirement of an humble and saddened spirit. By nature full of affection, kindness, and courtesy—graces which failed him not through all his trials—he had yet to learn, in the hard school of adversity, the still higher virtues of forgiveness, patience, submission, and resignation; seeking, in the shades of retirement and in the faithful discharge of the duties that yet remained to him as a man and a Christian, that peace of mind which the world cannot give; closing, as he has now done, a long and chequered life in the comfort and support of an humble, penitent, and thankful faith.

"The Standing Committee would further record, that, during their long official intercourse with Bishop Onderdonk, in his active Episcopate, through a period of more than fourteen years, they ever found him the courteous gentleman, the learned canonist, the judicious counsellor, the firm untiring administrator of the concerns of this great Diocese, which, for more than seven years of his Episcopate, comprehended the whole State of New-York.

"Under these convictions and feelings this entry is now made, and a copy of the same is directed to be sent to his bereaved family, with the deep sympathies of this Committee."

Dr. Vinton also read the resolutions passed at the meeting of clergy and laity in Trinity Church, on Monday, May 6th (given on p. 33), and the resolutions adopted by the Faculty of the General Theological Seminary, as follows:

"At the call of the Dean a special meeting of the Faculty of the General Theological Seminary was held May 6, 1861, in reference to the decease of the Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D. D., when the following Preamble and Resolutions were presented by Dr. Turner, and unanimously adopted:

"We have learned with deep regret that our Right Rev. Father, BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK, D. D., has been removed from the present state of trial to the Paradise of God. Since December 19, 1821, he occupied in this Institution the position of Professor of the Nature, Ministry, and Polity of the Church; and, since his consecration to the Episcopal office, always presided, when present, at the meetings of the Faculty. His long continued services as Professor were gratuitous, and entitle his memory to high respect and grateful affection. Being a man of clear mind and good practical sense, of industrious habits and untiring efforts—always gentlemanly and agreeable in demeanor, readily acceding to the wishes of a majority of his coadjutors, even when not in accordance with his own—he was remarkably successful in all business matters of administrative and executive character, and habitually respected by his brother Professors. His instructions in the department of Church Polity were in accordance with his well-known views—not at all indefinite, but very decided and strongly impressive. His kindness of disposition and amiableness of manners made him beloved by both the Faculty and the students. The sympathy which he habitually showed to the bereaved and afflicted; his soothing and charitable treatment of the poor and needy; the quiet patience with which he bore the afflictions whereby he was distressed; embalm the memory of him as a practical Christian in the hearts of all who knew him.

"Keeping in mind the virtues of the deceased, the Faculty unanimously pass the following Resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That, with proper regard to the providential agency of God in taking out of this world the soul of our deceased Father, we desire to express our Christian submission thereto in the language of the Divine Master—'Thy will be done.'

"*Resolved*, That, from due respect to the memory of our Right Rev. Head, the usual badge of mourning be worn for thirty days; and that on the day appointed for his interment the ordinary exercises of the Seminary be omitted.

"*Resolved*, That, in order to express our most sincere sympathy with the bereaved family, and especially with the deeply afflicted widow, a copy of the foregoing preamble and resolutions be respectfully communicated to her.

"*Resolved*, That the same be published in our Church papers in this city."

The Rev. Dr. Vinton, then, in a few brief words, narrated the substance of his last interview with Bishop Onderdonk, shortly before his death, when, at his own request, a portion of the Office for the Visitation of the Sick was used. In answer to the question, "Whether he repented him truly of his sins?" the dying Bishop did most humbly and truly testify his penitence for all his sins, known and unknown: adding, however, with deep and earnest feeling, "OF THE CHARGES UPON WHICH I HAVE BEEN CONDEMNED, MY CONSCIENCE ACQUITS ME IN THE SIGHT OF GOD."

The following verses of the 201st Hymn were then read by the Rev. William C. Doane, and sung with great power and effect by the choir and congregation; the hymn was a favorite one with the Bishop, and was felt by all present to be singularly appropriate to the occasion:

"Who are these in bright array?
This innumerable throng,
Round the Altar night and day
Tuning their triumphant song?"

Worthy is the Lamb once slain,
 Blessing, honor, glory, power,
 Wisdom, riches, to obtain ;
 New dominion every hour.

“These through fiery trials trod,
 These from great affliction came ;
 Now before the throne of God,
 Seal'd with His eternal name :
 Clad in raiment pure and white,
 Victor palms in every hand,
 Through their great Redeemer's might
 More than conquerors they stand.”

The Sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. Seabury, and there would have been a manifest inappropriateness in its being preached by any one else. He chose for his text the words of our Lord concerning S. John the Baptist, “He was a burning and a shining light : and ye were willing, for a season, to rejoice in his light.”* We shall undertake no analysis of this able and admirable discourse ;† nor will we attempt to forestall the reading of that full account of the earlier life of the Bishop, and the incidents of his ministerial and Episcopal career up to the time when, in the height of his powers, his reputation, and his usefulness, he was “*buried alive* :” nor that much more winning and edifying picture of his patience under nearly seventeen years of punishment, cheered only by a hope which, when it died, left him nothing on earth to live for. The preacher, from his childhood, had known the Bishop, and in the strongest language bore testimony to his moral purity, declaring that, during all that intimate friendship of almost a whole lifetime, he had never known that Bishop to utter anything that he should have been unwilling the angels of God should

* It is an interesting fact that these were the words chosen by Bishop Onderdonk as the text of the sermon preached by him on the death of Bishop Hobart.

† The sermon was first delivered in the Church of the Annunciation, on the Sunday following Bishop Onderdonk's death ; and was repeated, with slight alterations, at the request of his family and a number of his clergy, and with the sanction of the Bishop of the Diocese, at his funeral in Trinity Church. It has since been published at the request of the Bishops and clergy who heard it, and in compliance with the following resolution, which the Vestry of Trinity Church, with characteristic liberality and with a laudable desire to honor the memory of their departed Bishop, adopted and ordered on their Minutes :

“Resolved, That a copy of the sermon on the death of the late Bishop ONDERDONK, be requested of Dr. Seabury for publication, and that one thousand copies be published for gratuitous distribution, and the expenses attending the same be paid by the Comptroller.

“A true copy.

(Signed,)

“G. M. OGDEN, Clerk.”

hear, or that he would wish unsaid at the Day of Judgment. In answer to the concluding prayer of the preacher that we might all have grace through Jesus Christ our Lord, to follow after the patience, forgiveness, and humility of him who was now gone, there was heard, over all the congregation, a solemn and deep *Amen*.

After the ascription and the singing of the *Gloria Patri*, Dr. Vinton intoned the remainder of the Burial Service, except that the sentence, "I heard a voice," was sung with great feeling, as an anthem, by the choir. The choral *Amens* at the end of the concluding prayers and the Blessing, filled the air with softly swelling and dying harmony; and after the hush that followed, the dense crowds of clergy first, and people afterwards, slowly and sadly moved upwards towards the chancel, to behold the placid face of him whom they were henceforth to see no more on earth. He lay shrouded in his Episcopal robes as a Bishop ought to lie in his last sleep, his features as calm as if he had died only the evening before, and would surely awake in the morning. The shades of evening began to fall, and still the stream moved up the broad alley towards that glooming choir, as if it would never end, for not only had the church and every available spot within it, up to the very throat of the chancel, been filled, but there was a great gathering of hundreds outside the door, and spreading along the churchyard on either side of the nave, who had waited patiently in hope that once more they might look upon that reverend face. At length, when it was almost dark night, the lingering few—who had remained to the end because their love was the dearest—looked their last and went their way, weeping aloud as they went: and left the body in the dark and silent church alone with the watchers. All the night long the watchers—the chief of whom was the Rev. Dr. Johnson, of the General Theological Seminary, one of the most devoted of the Bishop's friends—remained there with the dead; and at midnight, and at the cockerowing, and in the morning, the great church was filled with the voice of prayer and praise. On Wednesday, at 10 o'clock, A. M., once more a large company of clergy and others assembled, and accompanied the body to Trinity Cemetery, where now "he sleeps in peace."

Tributes

TO THE

MEMORY OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES, AT THEIR MEETING, HELD IN THE CITY OF NEW-YORK, MAY 13TH, 1861.

WHEREAS, It has pleased Almighty God, in His all-wise Providence, to remove from his manifold trials and sufferings on earth to the rest of Paradise the soul of the Right Reverend BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, and Professor of the Nature, Ministry, and Polity of the Church, in the General Theological Seminary of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, from the date of the present organization, A. D. 1821 ;

And the Standing Committee desiring to place on their Minutes their sentiments on this solemn occasion, as a well-deserved tribute of respect to the memory of the deceased Prelate ; therefore,

Resolved, That the Standing Committee entertain the liveliest sense of the invaluable services rendered to the cause of religious education and sound doctrine by Bishop Onderdonk—by his vigorous discharge of the duties of his Professorship for nearly a quarter of a century, gratuitously rendered ; the dignity and urbanity of his demeanor as a member of the Faculty, and his affectionate intercourse with the students ; the impressive, clear, and judicious manner in which he imparted his instructions ; the unvarying earnestness with which he upheld the authority of the Christian Church as a Divine institution ; and the happy results of his teaching, as witnessed by a large body of the Alumni who enjoyed them, and still bear witness to their efficacy.

Resolved, secondly, That they cordially testify to the courtesy and efficiency with which, while in the active performance of his Episcopal duties, he presided over the proceedings of this Committee, and the deep interest he manifested in all measures calculated to promote the welfare of the Institution.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, PASSED AT THEIR MEETING, JUNE 29TH, 1861.

ON motion of the Bishop of Western New-York, it was

Resolved, That the Board of Trustees* of the General Theological Seminary put on record this expression of their sense of the value of the able, faithful, untiring, and gratuitous services of the late Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., while an acting Trustee and Professor of this Institution, for almost the quarter of a century; and the assurance of their sympathy and condolence with his friends and family, on his decease.

Resolved, That the Secretary transmit a copy of the above to the family of the deceased, and have it inserted in the periodicals of the Church.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY THE NEW-YORK BIBLE AND COMMON PRAYER BOOK SOCIETY, AT THEIR REGULAR MEETING, HELD ON THE FEAST OF S. BARNABAS, 1861.

THE death of the Right Rev. Father in God, BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., the Bishop of this Diocese, and the President of the Society and Chairman of its Board of Managers, being announced as having taken place at his residence in this city on the 30th April, 1861, since the last meeting of this Board—the following *notitie* of the late Right Rev. Prelate's connection with this Society were ordered to be entered on the Minutes of the proceedings of this Board as a testimony of affectionate respect for the deceased, viz.:

This Society was organized, A. D. 1809, composed of clergy and laity. By its Constitution the Board of Managers consisted of nine laymen and all the clergy of the Church residing in the city of New-York.

Immediately after his Ordination, in 1812, we find him at his seat in the Board of Managers, and the next year he took an active part in having the children of the free schools of the city, whose parents belonged to the Church, provided with Church sittings and Prayer Books. He continued his labors in the Board as a manager until the annual meeting of the Society, held on the feast of S. Matthias, in 1816, when he was elected Secretary, the duties of which he continued to discharge punctually until, on the demise of Bishop Hobart, he was consecrated Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, in November, 1830, when he became President of the Society and Chairman of the Board of Managers, *ex officio*, from which time he presided at all the annual meetings of the Society and of its Board of Managers, as a matter of conscience and of duty, up to the day that the sentence was inflicted upon him by the House of Bishops, in January, 1845, "suspending him from all exercise of Episcopal and Ministerial functions," from which time he, as modestly and conscientiously, refrained from the exercise of his functions as the head of this institution which was not touched by the sentence. But during the long years of his involuntary retirement from his cherished field of Episcopal labor up to

* The Trustees of the General Theological Seminary have ever recognized and stood by the Bishop of New-York. When, at the meeting in 1845, resolutions were introduced involving his removal from his office as Professor in the Institution, they were laid on the table by a vote of forty-one against eleven. Among the votes cast were ten given by Trustees of Dioceses whose Bishops had united in the condemnation of Bishop Onderdonk, and these stood seven in favor of retaining him as Professor and three against.

the day he was taken from us, he continued to manifest the liveliest interest in the Society's behalf.

And whereas, it has pleased the Great Head of the Church to take to Himself our late Right Rev. Father in God, and our President, therefore, be it—

Resolved, By this Board, that, in humble submission to the mysterious Providence which, during the last half of his Episcopate, caused our late President

“Through fiery trials to tread,”

and has now removed him from our midst to his reward in Paradise—this Board cannot refrain recording on its Minutes, their acknowledgments of the faithful and eminent services rendered this Society from the commencement of his connection with it; and their afflictive sense of the loss, which it, in common with the other interests of the Church, has sustained in the death of the illustrious deceased. And also their unfeigned union in the numerous demonstrations and well-deserved tributes of respect and affection, which have already been paid to his memory in this Diocese and the Diocese of his former charge—Western New-York—to his distinguished talent and zeal as a Christian Bishop—to the exemplary urbanity of his deportment—to the uniform firmness and integrity of his character—to his unobtrusive piety and meekness—and to his crowning glory—his patient and uncomplaining sufferings as a CONFESSOR and MARTYR, “for Christ His Body's sake.”

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NEW-YORK P. E. TRACT SOCIETY.

THE death of the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., the Bishop of this Diocese, and President of this Society, having been announced as having transpired since the last meeting of this Board, the following *notitiæ* were ordered to be entered upon the Minutes of its proceedings.

This Society was organized in this city in the year A. D. 1810. Bishop Onderdonk graduated from Columbia College in this City in the year 1809, and was admitted to Deacon's Orders in 1812, immediately engaged to assist in Divine Service at Trinity Church, and elected Assistant Minister therein, October 30, 1813.

Bishop Hobart was President, *ex officio*, of this Society from his consecration in 1811, to the day of his death, in 1830.

From the earliest records of this Society now extant, it appears that in 1816 the late Bishop was a member of the Committee on Selections, which place he held until the day of his consecration as Bishop, Nov. 26; 1830, when he became its President and Chairman of the Committee on Selections, *ex officio*, and so continued until the day of his death, on April 30, 1861.

From the well-known energy, zeal, and activity of the Bishop in his early life—his early and close connection with his friend Bishop Hobart, and early associations with him as one of the assistant ministers of Trinity Church—it is natural and safe to suppose, that he was among the first founders of this institution. Hence the fact is as conclusive as it is pleasing and satisfactory, that all the tracts upon the catalogue of this Society, down to the close of 1830, have received the careful revision of two of the most learned, eminent, and doctrinally sound Bishops of the American Church, and continued by the late Bishop until a very short period antecedent to his death.

Therefore, in grateful acknowledgment of the eminent services which our late President and Right Rev. Father in God has rendered by his labors in this Society to the cause of religious truth, sound Church doctrine, and the Apostolic Succession, be it—

Resolved, That we cherish a grateful sense of his labors in carrying out the objects of this Society—his many manly virtues—his punctuality in his attendance at all the meetings of this Board, as appears from its records—and especially as its presiding officer after he had entered upon the Episcopate—his uniform kindness and urbanity in the discharge of his official duties, and the interest always manifested by him in promoting the welfare and usefulness of the Society, and his paternal care for the spiritual good of its members.

Resolved, That a copy of this entry be sent to the family of the deceased by the Secretary of this Society.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE STUDENTS OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

At a meeting of the students of the General Theological Seminary, held on Thursday morning, the 2d of May, to take action relative to the death of the Bishop of New-York—the Dean, the Rev. Milo Mahan, D. D., presiding—the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

WHEREAS, It hath pleased Almighty God to remove by death from among us, the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese, and for thirty-nine years Professor of the Nature, Ministry, and Polity of the Church, in this Institution: And,

WHEREAS, We hold in pleasant remembrance the gentle virtues, the dignified humility of the deceased, and the peaceful termination of a long and much-tried life; therefore, be it

Resolved, That while we bow with profound resignation to the Divine will, we esteem it our mournful duty—no less than sad pleasure—to place on record this tribute of our respect for the memory of the departed, for his learning, and for the paternal affability which distinguished him in his relations as Professor and friend.

Resolved, That while we tender to the relatives and friends of the deceased, the assurance of our unfeigned sympathy in their affliction, we remind them and ourselves of the consolation which we have in the hope of a blessed resurrection.

Resolved, That, as a token of our respect, we attend the funeral of our late Right Rev. Professor in a body.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to the family of the deceased, and also to the leading Church papers.

EDMUND GUILBERT,
CHARLES F. ROBERTSON, } *Committee.*
HENRY G. PERRY,

NEW-YORK, May 2, 1861.

TRIBUTE OF THE BISHOP OF ILLINOIS.

As I left my own poor record of services, tempted by thoughts spontaneous from inward groaning, or the imparted griefs of other bosoms, so now I return to it, past the "grave and gate of death." It is meet so to do. Well for the living Bishop to cast his eye back or forward, standing by the bier of his dead brothers. The work "while it is called to-day" gathers urgency, and the heart hushes more easily its vanity and plaints when drawing near to those who have just "finished their course, and rest from their labors." Close and thick lie these memorials. One breathes out his willing soul just as the cannon booms that shivers a nation's glory. Another drops alone, panting on the dusty highway; and a third "bows himself upon the bed's head," at threescore and ten, thankful that a weary life is ended. It were well to die, in any hour or way—for life has earned its best—when a man goes away, followed by such mourning and eulogy as have the good Bishop of Alabama or the Assistant of Pennsylvania.

After touchingly alluding to these two prelates, Bishop Whitehouse says:

With the Right Reverend BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, Bishop of New-York, I have been united in all the changes of my own life, from boyhood onwards. With him, as Professor of "the Nature and Polity of the Church," my student-life in the Seminary was drawn into indulgent intimacy. Under him as Bishop—successor to the one on whose arm I lay as an infant at the Font—I wrought out the large share of my pastoral life; and when the vicissitudes came of his resolute ministry, and the discipline of the Church fell upon him, I was participant in the griefs and struggles of his bewildered Diocese. I have watched his wonderful submission to that strange burthen; the fealty with which he honored its authority, while he consciously denied its justice; the martyr firmness with which for long years he refused the open refuge of the civil tribunal; the plaintive meekness with which he confessed error and bewailed sin; the honest self-respect with which he steadied himself at the line where conscience absolved him; the daily testimony of his devotional life; the quiet seclusion in which he walked the streets where homes and graves were precious from birthright, and an unbroken franchise of the heart—where the infant had smiled as angels whispered, the boy had played, the collegian donned his manly honors—the Pastor threaded its waste places, and endeared himself in its more stately homes; where the Mitre was laid upon his brow, and where, through these changes, the sanctuary grew of the Husband and Father, until at last, the step became feeble and the back bent, and other generations than his own said, as he passed, "The poor old Bishop is going!" These things have I seen and felt, until I longed that the penalty could be remitted, the touching pleading heard, and that, in restricted form at least, he might again stand to preach the Word and minister the Sacraments, lay his hand on some young head, and be borne to his grave without attainder on his estate, as Bishop in the Church of God.

Wiser than myself in solemn council thought it could not be. The door of life was closed on his last longing for earth, and now the grave has closed on his labors, his failings, and his sorrows.

But we cannot forget his large, vigorous, unselfish nature; his working powers inexhaustible, at the service of all who needed; his inimitable courtesy and social kindness; the hand generous to carelessness; his crowded work and ringing voice that disdained fatigue; the chivalric

truth in the utterance of his matured convictions; his dauntless action where right, as he thought, led the way; the inflexible constancy of his life's opinions and attachments; the vigorous harmony of the man, faults and all; the gentleness that made the firmest and hardest qualities instinct with love: such traits as these, and more also, far, will many living carry in heart-remembrance, and posterity receive and keep IN MEMORIAM.—
Address to the Annual Convention of the Diocese of Illinois, September 12th, 1861.

[From *The Church Journal* of May 8, 1861.]

BISHOP ONDERDONK.

At rest at last!—poor stricken man of God,
Thy toilsome day of weary strife is o'er;
Welcome to thee the shelter of the tomb,
Welcome the quiet rest of Heaven's calm shore.

Tossed on the angry waves of strife so long,
The heaving billows of man's puny wrath,
How sweet to thee the everlasting song,
The glory beaming on thy heavenward path.

At rest at last!—O blessed rest for thee;
Rest for the aching brow on Jesus' breast,
Rest for the bleeding heart, the weary frame,
The rest of Heaven: eternal, changeless rest.

Fond memory leads me back a little space,
Back from the dreary scenes which now I view,
Back to my early years—the Church I loved,
And thee, my childhood's guide, so good, so true.

A couch of suffering, a mother dear,
A holy *priest* that suffering form beside,
Sweet prayers and spoken words of blessed cheer,
And hallowed emblems of the Crucified.

A church: a kneeling band; a reverend form;
A hand in blessing laid upon each brow;—
How vividly the scene before me lies:—
That thrilling touch—I seem to feel it now.

My Father, how my heart with anguish bled
As the dark storm-cloud gathered round thy way;
When burst its wrath on thy devoted head,
So meekly bowed beneath the tempest's sway.

And when the wrath of man had worked thy fall,
Unmurmuring didst thou lay thy honors down;
In calm retirement cast thy griefs on GOD,
Take up thy cross to win a glorious crown!

A fadeless crown of amaranthine bloom,
A heavenly recompense awaits thee now ;
Thy rest is gained, thy Saviour's loving hand,
His own right hand, shall place it on thy brow.

Warm friends and true are gathered round thy bier,
And eyes are wet, and anguished bosoms swell ;
O many a heart will hold thy memory dear ;
My Father, friend and Bishop, fare thee well !

May 5th, 1861.

E. W.

The Crusade against the Bishop of New-York.

EARLY MANIFESTATIONS OF HOSTILITY.

PROMINENT in the early history of the causes which led to the present ment and trial of Bishop Onderdonk, stand the names of the Right Rev. Philander Chase, late Presiding Bishop, the Right Rev. C. P. McIlvaine, and the Rev. James C. Richmond.

The notorious instrumentality of the latter, as a minister of vengeance in preparing evidence for the trial, may be accounted for by the salutary check which his self-proposed elevation to the Episcopate of Turkey received at the hands of Bishop Onderdonk. So also it may be said that the high-toned satisfaction of Bishop Chase, in receiving and *attempting* to lay before the House of Bishops, in 1844, a paper which he said related to the character and conduct of Bishop Onderdonk, is explained by the fact, that, whilst Bishop Hobart was in England, exposing the scheme of Bishop Chase to raise funds for the establishment of a seminary in Ohio, as a rival institution to the General Theological Seminary, Bishop Onderdonk took part in the discussion by the publication of an able pamphlet, sustaining Bishop Hobart. The other member of the group, the Right Rev. C. P. McIlvaine, first finds his way before the Church as the *accuser* of Bishop Onderdonk, in the form of a letter, dated March 6, 1841, which appeared in the *Episcopal Recorder*, addressed to the Rev. Dr. Seabury, then editor of *The Churchman*, from which we make the following extracts. This attack of Bishop McIlvaine may be regarded as the manifesto of the war then beginning to be waged. We make the quotations merely to show the *animus* of the letter in its bearing upon the Bishop of New-York, without any reference whatever to the merits of the controversy.

BISHOP McILVAINE'S LETTER.

WERE it not for other matters in your remarks, I should not have taken the trouble to notice the above specimens of what is going on in the Church,

under an editor, whose paper is formally announced as "the official organ of the Bishop of the Diocese of New-York," and as being "under his general direction and supervision." But as it is, I will say something as to your expressions of contempt and ridicule, and your charge of "almost heresy." Such language, I confess, pains and mortifies me exceedingly—and so does it many others, who are *not likely to bear the pain very patiently*. But, why does it thus affect me—because it injures me? My dear sir, you may write thus all your life, if you choose, so far as I care on my own account. Your ridicule or contempt is very harmless. Very likely it will have the effect of setting many to reading both the book and the Charge, who otherwise would not have done so. I ask no other answer to your charge of "almost heresy," than that those who read what you have written, will also read what I have written. But why, then, am I so pained and mortified? Is it because such treatment and such opposition from you were unexpected? Alas, Dr. Seabury, I have known you too long and too well, not to know just how such truth, even what, in my view, is no other than "the glorious Gospel of the blessed God," would be relished by you. I know you would utterly despise, detest, and ridicule it, just as you have done. And I have no idea that you have expressed all you feel with regard to it. Your hatred of such truth is, I have no doubt, even much greater than you have expressed. I say it feelingly and solemnly, for I know the awfulness of such a state of mind. And if I supposed you would deny it, were it not that I suppose you wish to be considered as in that state of mind, I would not thus lay it to your charge. But as long as I thus understand the views and tastes which you avow, let me tell you seriously, not in the spirit of severity, that until there shall be reason to suppose that God has wrought a great, and what I should call a very blessed change, in your views and tastes and sympathies—when I shall publish any thing distinctive concerning the great matters of the Gospel, especially as to *what a poor sinner must do to be saved*—I shall feel much more confident that I speak "*the truth as it is in Jesus*;" if I find you loathing it, as you do my Charge, than if I shall find you praising it.

You recently published in your paper of November 7th, a most abusive and abominable attack upon me, headed "*Oxford Tracts—Charity Exemplified*." You charged me with having refused to receive a person as a candidate for Orders, "because he had declined joining a teetotal society, and attending Services where the Liturgy was dishonored."

* * * * *

But let us ask again, why does your treatment so pain and mortify me? I answer, because of the painful consideration that *The Churchman* is so widely regarded as representing the clergy of the Diocese of New-York, and especially because it is "the official organ of the Bishop of New-York," and is under his avowed "*general direction and supervision*," and therefore when it calls my Charge "almost heretical," it is the Bishop of New-York whom the Bishop of Ohio must consider as thus speaking; and when it ridicules the writing of the Bishop of Ohio as "mere romance," "not even founded on fact," and as the work of a writer "incompetent," and as containing "a perversion of historical truth," it is not merely Dr. Seabury who is responsible, but *it is his endorser and patron and director and supervisor, his protector in these things; it is the Bishop of New-York*, who is just so much the more responsible for these expressions and charges, as his influence in giving them weight is greater; and so will he be held by the Church as well as by myself. You may form some idea

how this matter appears to others by the following letter of a presbyter of a large Diocese *not in the West*. The letter came with your article, and refers to it. "Wherever," says the writer, "the responsibility may lie, I am greatly mistaken if there be not a very large number who will not be satisfied until it is distinctly understood where the responsibility does lie. *If there be no power in the Church by which such an evil may be reached, at least by official censure, our discipline must be defective.* Can it be that both the spirit and the principles and the doctrines held are not a subject of grief and shame to a large portion of our Church? If it be not so, even in the Diocese of New-York, it opens our minds to a melancholy state of things indeed."

* * * * *

But here I must say that I would not have spoken in this letter touching the responsibility under which I hold the Bishop of New-York for the conduct of *The Churchman* towards me, were it not that I have faithfully and respectfully and kindly tried in vain by a private correspondence to obtain from that Bishop some satisfaction, at least some expression of regret for the abominable attack upon my *official proceedings*, in the case of the candidate above referred to. My first letter he answered, by declining to be considered as responsible, in the way I held him to be, for such things in *The Churchman*; while not a word has he said, to indicate that, in the article complained of, he does not entirely concur. My second letter is, to this day, unanswered, though it was written nearly two months ago.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S REPLY.

TO THE EDITORS OF THE "EPISCOPAL RECORDER:"

Gentlemen—My Right Reverend brother, the Bishop of Ohio, having thought proper to arraign me before the public through your columns, I respectfully request permission to make, through the same medium, a brief reply. It will be brief, because of my fixed determination, for reasons which will be appreciated by all who rightly feel for the honor of the Church, not to yield to the occasion thus sought for a newspaper controversy with a brother Bishop.

It is proper for me to state, that Bishop McIlvaine's second letter to me was a reiteration of the demand made upon me by the first, as holding a position which, in my reply to it, I totally disavowed, and the responsibilities of which I entirely disclaimed. There was, therefore, the same difficulty in the way of the reply which he desired that there was in the case of the first letter. It would have involved an admission which I could not conscientiously make. There were other obvious modes of eliciting my views and opinions in the case, without compromise of principle on my part, to which the Bishop could have easily had recourse, but which he did not see fit to adopt.

It ought to be distinctly understood, that in my reply to the Bishop I gave prominence to Dr. Seabury's "Christian and honorable readiness, at all times, to admit into his paper all properly written vindications from injustice supposed to have been done by it, and appeals from what may have been painful to the feelings of others, or be deemed an improper editorial interference," and stated that "if an editor of *The Churchman* should fail in these respects, I should deem it a serious disqualification for his office, and feel compelled to notice it as such."

In the Bishop's second letter to me, and in his communication to your paper, stress is laid on *The Churchman's* being announced as my *official*

organ of communication with my Diocese. For what reason, I was for a long time at a loss to imagine. It appeared to me that this had no connection whatever with the matters in which that paper was deemed so offensive. At length, however, it occurred to me, as barely possible, that the obvious meaning of the terms might be misunderstood. This possibility must be my apology to your intelligent readers, for saying that nothing more is herein meant than that *The Churchman* is the medium through which appointments and other official matters, are announced to my Diocese.

It is very obvious, from the pains which the Bishop takes to make it appear that I am even more responsible for the faults, rather, in his representation, the grievous criminality, of the editor of *The Churchman*, than that editor himself, that he has me in his eye, in his solemn charges of enmity to God's truth, and departure from His Gospel. I acknowledge not the authority of the Bishop of Ohio thus publicly to reprove and rebuke a brother Bishop; but pray that I may have grace rather to receive his judgment in the spirit of meekness, than to let it be the cause of any unkind or unchristian feelings towards him.

I will not pretend to vindicate myself against the awful charges which a brother Bishop has brought against me. I have ever had an unconquerable aversion to obtruding my personal concerns upon the public. If I deserve public censure and reprobation, all attempts to repel them must ultimately fail. If I do not, I had rather, much rather, let it appear in what the grace of God may allow me of Christian character and deportment—of the living manifestation of the true faith and sound principles of the Gospel, than in any set defence. I am before my Diocese and the Church under the awful responsibilities of the Apostolic Office. A newspaper vindication of my character, principles, and official acts, can be of little importance, if my daily walk, duties, and ministrations, are not sufficient; and a newspaper attack upon either is little to be regarded, if that walk, and those duties and ministrations, are what they should be.

Therefore, Messrs. Editors, I have done, I trust, forever, with any public connection with the matter which has called forth this communication. Whatever merit, or the reverse, may be attached to drawing public attention to the faults of a brother Bishop, is left, unshared by me, to my brother of Ohio.

Particularly requesting the favor of the insertion of this, in your paper of next Saturday,

I am, gentlemen, yours very truly,

NEW-YORK, April 3, 1841.

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK.

The spirit of the extracts which elicited this reply was followed up in the General Convention of 1841, by the House of Bishops, who then passed the first Canon for the trial of a Bishop, the Right Rev. C. P. McIlvaine being on the Committee who reported it. From this time the crusade against Bishop Onderdonk became more vigorous, and at the next meeting of the General Convention, in 1844, the Rev. Dr. Hawks presented another Canon for the trial of a Bishop, which was adopted as a substitute for the one passed in 1841, the sequel showing that the more complete instrument was specially intended to meet the peculiar proceedings about to be required in the case of Bishop Onderdonk, whose guileless nature led him to favor its adoption, without even a suspicion that he was

the secret subject of all the specious legislation then and thus carried on, for the avowed object of benefitting the Church!

THE DIOCESAN CONVENTION OF 1843.

THE most noticeable event of this Convention was the business relating to the Ordination of the Rev. Arthur Carey, respecting which Bishop Onderdonk spoke as follows, in his address to the Convention :

"It is well known to you, my brethren, that the Ordination just mentioned has been made matter of very extraordinary publicity. The course which this has taken has had connections and bearings which have brought to view important principles whereon I deem it a duty to express to you, and place on record, deliberately-formed and conscientious views and convictions.

"At the foundation of the whole lies the fact, that when, in this Ordination, the prescribed call was made on the people for the showing of any impediment or notable crime, on account of which either of the persons presented should not be ordained, two presbyters of the Diocese, avowedly acting in their capacity as such, read each a written form of objection and protest, charging one of the candidates with unsoundness in the faith. The charge thus preferred had been previously laid before me, fully investigated, and found not to be sustained. This was stated by me to the congregation as the reason why there was no just cause for the delay in ordaining an accused person, provided for in the Rubric. The solemn Service proceeded accordingly, and all the persons presented were ordained. With a strengthened conviction of having acted justly and righteously in this matter, I deem it to be highly proper in itself, and peculiarly demanded by the trying circumstances in which the young brother concerned has been thrown, thus publicly to express unshaken confidence in him, and to commend him to the confidence and affection of the Church."

Certain resolutions were introduced by Judge Oakley, relating to the above Ordination, and containing an "official attack" upon the Bishop. Before the consideration of these resolutions, Bishop Onderdonk delivered the following address :

Brethren—I cannot resist the solemn impulse of duty to address you, before entering on the special business of the morning, a few words of affectionate counsel.

The eyes of the world are upon us. THE EYE OF GOD IS UPON US. Wicked attempts are making without to rend us asunder by jealousies, and provoke dissension in our happy communion. To meet these, be we all as one man. Clinging to Christ, His Cross, and His Church, let us resolve that we *will* be one, in order, in affection, and in all other particulars of that Spirit of Christ which should be in all His members.

Happily the shape given to the resolutions now before us, and the principles, feelings, and intentions, avowed by the respected member who introduced them, give us no just reason to fear the introduction of doctrinal points, which cannot be here settled, and the discussion of which can do nothing but harm; or of those having personal bearings, the extent of whose malign influences can hardly be conceived.

In the fear of God, the love of Christ, and pure and holy devotion to

His Church, go on. And let me affectionately commend to you the blessed spirit manifested in the great and judicious Hooker, when the end of his holy life was approaching—(*which of us knows how near the end of his life he may be?*)—and of which this sacred festival* has reminded me. Speaking of the solemn period just after that saint had received the Holy Communion—which I would to God all of you had done this day—his biographer observes: “which”—the administration of the Communion—“being performed, the doctor thought he saw a reverend gayety and joy in his face; but it lasted not long; for his bodily infirmities did return suddenly, and became more visible; insomuch that the doctor apprehended death ready to seize him: yet, after some amendment, left him at night with a promise to return early the day following: which he did, and then found him better in appearance, deep in contemplation, and not inclinable to discourse; which gave the doctor occasion to inquire his present thoughts. To which he replied, THAT HE WAS MEDITATING THE NUMBER AND NATURE OF ANGELS AND THEIR BLESSED OBEDIENCE AND ORDER, WITHOUT WHICH PEACE COULD NOT BE IN HEAVEN; AND OH THAT IT MIGHT BE SO ON EARTH!”

The debate, in which Messrs. Duer and John Anthon were the chief speakers, began about 12½ o'clock on Friday, September 29, and by 4 o'clock a vote taken on the “resolutions as amended,” and next on the resolutions, proved them to be negatived by a majority of the laity, and an overwhelming majority of the clergy. On the resolutions as amended, the clerical votes stood, ayes 18, noes 101; and the lay votes, ayes 35, noes 53; and on the “resolutions” the clerical votes were, ayes 18, noes 97; and the lay votes, ayes 37, noes 47: the discrepancy being attributable, as we believe, to the circumstance, that after the former vote had been taken, several left the House, under the impression that the business was finished.

Towards the close of the meeting of the Convention, Mr. Duer read a document expressive of dissent from a part of the Bishop's Address recommending the Catholic principles advocated in *The Churchman*, and other periodicals, and requested that, after the signatures to it were completed, it might be entered on the Minutes. The Bishop peremptorily refused this, on the ground that it was neither the place nor the time to censure his official communications to the clergy and laity of his Diocese.

Before the Convention separated, the Bishop delivered the following address:

Brethren—It is a blessed fact, interwoven with the whole history of our Church, delightfully indicative of its conservative character, and which ought to command our devout gratitude for the overruling grace of God, that differences among us never make any serious inroads on our unity and harmony. Over and over again have the enemies of Christ and His cause predicted the reverse, and as often have their predictions—and what, from the obvious spirit in which these were obtruded, it hardly is a breach of charity to call their *hopes*—been frustrated. Events have occurred, on which serious differences of opinion have been conscientiously maintained. Discussions have arisen in which honest warmth has existed. Sometimes

* Festival of S. Michael and All Angels.

good men have been taken off their guard, and yielding too much to natural impulse in their feelings and sensibilities, have spoken unadvisedly with their lips, and thus provoked danger of undue passion and excitement. The decision once made, however, all has been quieted. The enemy has been ashamed, being deprived of the power of saying what he gladly would have said against us, that we too have been rent by dissension and schism. Our union has been strengthened, and our mutual affection unimpaired. Under God, this has been largely occasioned by the happy polity which gives to all orders of men among us—Bishops, clergy, and laity—their respective opportunities of full influence in our concerns.

Our present position has prompted these remarks.

This Convention has been one of no common interest. It is unusually large. It came together under the expectation by all, that questions of an unprecedented character might be brought before it, and that causes of much excitement might grow up in it. The Church throughout our land has looked to it as one of very special importance. Opponents and enemies of the Church, whether under the Christian name, or of ranks hostile to it, anticipated confusion and schism as the result; and friends there were who could not dismiss fears of danger of that result. Serious questions have arisen. Earnest debate has ensued. Every one has had a fair opportunity to be heard. The decision has been duly and orderly made. Surely I am not wrong in anticipating, that what has been will be. Christian submission and contentment will characterize us all. Discord will cease. Union and harmony will be restored; and all will go to their respective homes with renewed resolutions to devote themselves to the service of Christ and His Church. May it be so! I ask, dear brethren, the union of your prayers with mine, that God, of his infinite mercy, will grant that it may be so.

PASTORAL LETTER IN RELATION TO THE ORDINATION OF THE REV. ARTHUR CAREY.

TO THE CLERGY AND PEOPLE OF MY SPIRITUAL CHARGE:

Brethren, beloved in the Lord—It is due to the sacred relation which I bear to you that I apprise you of my having communicated to my brethren, the Bishops of the Church in these United States, a solemn remonstrance, protest, and demand, growing out of the manner in which I have been treated by three of them in reference to the discharge of my Episcopal functions.

This remonstrance, protest, and demand, are contained in the following document, which I have addressed to the said Right Reverend brethren:

“To the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, their brother the undersigned, the Bishop of New York, feels himself compelled by a sacred and imperious sense of duty to his Office and his Diocese, and to the Church and its Divine Head, to communicate this his solemn remonstrance, protest, and demand. Three of our number, to wit, the Bishops of Illinois, Vermont, and Ohio, have thought proper publicly to make insinuations and lay charges against the undersigned, in matters connected with an Ordination held by him in the month of July last; which charges and insinuations involve the accusation of the undersigned on points deeply affecting the Scriptural integrity and soundness of his doctrines, his devotion to the true interests and welfare of the portion of CHRIST’S Church of which he is one of the chief pastors, his faithfulness to his own Diocese, and consequently his fitness for the high and sacred Office with which, in the course of God’s providence, and by the appointment of HIS HOLY SPIRIT, he has been invested.

“The Bishop of Illinois has referred in a published pamphlet to the aforesaid Ordination as a step towards bringing the most serious evils upon the Church, soiling her doc-

trinal purity, changing essentially her character, blasting her prosperity, and ruining her institutions. The Bishop of Ohio has denounced it to his Convention and to the world as deserving the highest censure, and fraught with danger to the Church, and grounds upon it a virtual threat not to receive clergymen into his Diocese on letters of dismission from the undersigned, because of their being no security for the doctrinal soundness of the party dismissed. The Bishop of Vermont, besides himself censuring it at large, justifies the aforesaid acts of his brethren of Illinois and Ohio, on the ground of ancient allowance in the Catholic Church of one Bishop's interfering in the Diocese of another, when the latter was in *heresy*, or otherwise bringing *alarming evils* upon the Church. This, therefore, is the character attributed by him to the undersigned.

"Our religion teaches us how Christian brethren, in the privacy of confidential intercourse, should kindly rebuke each other for their faults. The Church, in her wise Canonical provisions, points out the way in which, in due and orderly manner, her Bishops are amenable to her laws, are accountable for their offences, and are allowed a fair hearing in vindication from charges which may be brought against them. Neither of these Christian and just courses has, however, in the present instance, been pursued. The undersigned has been branded by brother Bishops before the Church and the world, without notice, and in avoidance, by his accusers, of the mode canonically prescribed for bringing charges against a brother, and allowing him the common justice of being put, in due and orderly manner, on his defence. They have proclaimed his alleged unfaithfulness to the world, instead of telling it, for her just decision thereon, to the Church.

"Now, therefore, the undersigned hereby solemnly remonstrates and protests to his brethren the Bishops of the American Church, and through them to that Church, against this procedure of his aforesaid brethren, the Bishops of Illinois, Vermont, and Ohio, as unjust, unchristian, and in opposition to the true spirit of the system of ecclesiastical law and order to which they have solemnly promised conformity.

"And further the undersigned hereby, in the name of God and of his Holy Church, demands of his said brethren, the Right Reverend Philander Chase, D. D., Bishop of Illinois, the Right Reverend John Henry Hopkins, D. D., Bishop of Vermont, and the Right Reverend Charles Petit McIlvaine, D. D., Bishop of Ohio, that if they are honestly persuaded that the undersigned is justly liable to the charges which they have brought or insinuated against him, they do forthwith, agreeably to the Canon of the General Convention entitled '*Of the Trial of Bishops*,' present him for trial; that thus it may be fairly and canonically tested whether he is guilty, or whether they are mistaken accusers. Which, if they shall neglect to do, the undersigned will feel himself fully justified in regarding the accusations as withdrawn, and demanding that they be no more repeated.

"Should the Bishop of Illinois think that his station as Senior or Presiding Bishop precludes his acting as a presenter, the undersigned earnestly requests that any other brother Bishop, who may coincide in opinion with those who have publicly arraigned him, will unite in the presentment.

"On his accusing brethren, and such others as agree with them in sentiment and views on this solemn and important subject, the undersigned urges the above-mentioned course of presentment as that which only is consistent with the responsibilities and obligations imposed by laws to which, in the name of God, they have solemnly promised obedience.

"BENJ. T. ONDERDONK,

"*Bishop of New-York.*

"*NEW-YORK, January 26, 1844.*"

The necessity of such action on my part, is, I assure you, my dearly beloved, extremely painful to me. I was aware that a conscientious Bishop could hardly fulfil his official obligations and responsibilities, in this ill-judging and wicked world, without exciting opposition. Nor ought I to be surprised that such opposition should often be manifested in a temper and mode especially natural to the carnal mind, and at variance with the spirit and affections of the renewed Christian heart. I was aware that the wholesome laws of our branch of the Catholic Church had rightly placed its Bishops under the responsibilities involved in the power of presenting them for trial vested in their respective Conventions, and in any three of their own order.

But I confess I was not prepared for the humiliating sight of Bishops, passing by the mode which the Church provides for the regular impeachment of a brother, publicly assailing him for his solemn official acts through

the medium of the press. I was not prepared to see Right Reverend Fathers of the Church making common cause with ordinary pamphleteers and newspaper writers of the day by joining in *their* attacks upon one of their own order. It is a well-known principle of Catholic law in the Church of God, that, save in strong and decided cases of Episcopal defection and mal-conduct, no Bishop can rightly interfere with the diocesan acts and prerogatives of another, or assume to himself the privilege of holding a brother directly or indirectly responsible to him. The violation of this principle was the first step towards papal assumptions, whence, by the natural results of effects from causes, were ultimately brought in the manifold, grievous, and antichristian evils with which the Popish system has cursed the Church. I was therefore not prepared for being impeached by a brother Bishop before his Convention for official acts in my own Diocese. That brother knew full well that impeachment in another quarter, *were he confident of right*, was a duty binding upon him by laws to which he had solemnly promised conformity.

Thus, however, brethren, has your Bishop been treated. My three brethren, the Bishops of Illinois, Vermont, and Ohio, who have pointed me out to the Church and the world as sufficiently faulty to require a *public mark* of their disapprobation, I will not so far underrate, touching their intellectual perception, and moral sense, as to suppose them capable of such treatment of a brother without appreciating its inseparable connection with the idea of his unfitness for his office, or at least of such a probability thereof as should subject him to peculiar vigilance, if not to public suspicion and distrust.

Those brethren knew that for testing the correctness of this idea the Church has provided a regular and orderly method. This they have not pursued. In the course which they *have* pursued, your Bishop, dear brethren, is the last man to be willing to follow them. He feels that he cannot do this consistently with a proper view of his office, and of his obligations to the Church. He shrinks, however, from no regular and orderly inspection and trial of his conduct. This he invites and demands. He utterly refuses to meet a brother Bishop, on questions of this nature, as a pamphleteer-opponent in strife before the world. The Church points out his line of responsibility for his official acts, and the mode in which he is to be called to answer for them. In these he is willing to meet all inquiry, and render all legal account. Others he must be excused for considering as by no means entitled to his respect or submission.

Many of you, my reverend brethren, will remember the sentiment I have often expressed of the unworthy and unchristian character of a disposition to blazon the faults of a brother in the Ministry, connected with unwillingness and even refusal to assume the responsibility of Canonical presentment, and of honestly bearing testimony in due Canonical form. Private rebuke and reproof of an erring brother is right and good, and often a bounden duty. But public reproach, save under the wholesome restraints and just security of defence, provided by law, has hardly the shadow of Christian allowance under which to find refuge.

The Apostle of the Gentiles, in addressing his children in the faith, when open enemies and false friends were endeavoring to diminish or destroy the influence which he would exert over them in the godly jealousy wherewith he was affected towards their spiritual and eternal good, was sometimes moved by the Holy Ghost to lay before them^e his claims to their confidence. The multiplied manifestations from all parts of the Diocese, wherewith I have been cheered, my dear brethren of the clergy and laity, with affectionate assurances of your love and confidence amidst the attacks and reproaches to which I have been exposed from both Christians and

the sons of Belial—and let me add, similar manifestations from all sections of our Church, and from Christian brethren in other and distant parts of the world*—have been the more welcome to my grateful heart, from the hope that they have not been merely *personal*, nor unconnected with an appreciation of my ministerial and Episcopal character founded on my manner of life since my first entrance on the Diaconate.

Efforts have been made, brethren, to deprive me of your confidence by subjecting me to distrust on the score of unsoundness in the faith. May I be allowed to say that if every minister of Christ could make a wide appeal on this subject, your Bishop may humbly presume to do so?

Through the whole of my ministry, extending to nearly thirty-two years, I have lived and labored in this my native city. For nearly the quarter of a century I was a constant preacher in a parish comprising three of the largest congregations in our country, and maintained among them a diligent pastoral intercourse, the opportunities afforded by which for making fully known my theological principles and views I trust I never neglected; and of which my heart prompts me to add, that there were therein formed spiritual alliances that I humbly hope will not be without their influence on heavenly felicity; that the remembrance of it furnishes me with some of my happiest and sweetest moments of reflection; and that its loss is among the largest and most trying sacrifices which I have been called to make to the wider sphere and more onerous burden of obligation which the Episcopate has laid upon me.

Very many of the children in the Lord to whom I have thus frankly, fully, and affectionately imparted my views of Christian doctrine, have emigrated to all parts of our Diocese and our country.

My Episcopate of more than thirteen years has been spent in preaching the word in a Diocese which continues after, as it was before another was set off from it, to be by far the largest in the Union; and whence, every year, Churchmen have gone out into all parts of the land.

For about twenty-five years I have been constantly engaged in directing the studies of candidates for the Holy Ministry. Certainly not less than three hundred of our present clergy, including four of my Right Reverend brethren, settled in all our borders, have thus been made well acquainted with my religious doctrines and views.

I confidently appeal to all, Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, who have thus had ample opportunity of knowing my doctrines and opinions, for the frankness and fulness with which I have ever expressed them. Surely, brethren, in any charges or insinuations which may be ventured against me of theological unfaithfulness, I may confidently make a very large application of my Master's appeal in behalf of His integrity, "*Ask them which heard me, what I have said unto them. Behold, they know what I said.*"

It is a comfort for me to reflect, my dear brethren, that such boasting is hardly needful for you. Ye all know what has been my coming in and going out among you; and most sensibly do I feel, and most gratefully do I acknowledge, the manifold evidences I am constantly receiving of your unimpaired confidence and affection. The best return for this are the affectionate love which I ever bear towards you, the constant prayers in

* I trust I shall be excused for selecting, in the confidence of its proving gratifying to you, the following extract from the letter of a reverend brother, recently returned from an excursion to the Mediterranean in quest of health: "The clergy of the Church of England, whom I saw in Asia Minor and elsewhere, inquired for you with much interest, and expressed no little sympathy for you in the trials to which some of your official duties have subjected you."

which I remember you at the throne of grace, and my heartfelt devotion to your spiritual and eternal good. These, the Lord being my Helper, you shall continue to have. I most sensibly feel indeed that the fulfilment of this sacred, sincere, and honest promise will involve perpetually increasing anxiety and labor. I know that I must more and more withdraw myself from all other than official care, solicitude, and occupation. This, however, I am prepared to do. But I feel that I need herein your faithful fervent prayers for the support, direction, aid, and blessing of the Holy Ghost. These, dear brethren, let me have.

The necessity for addressing you at this time is connected with a very peculiar and unprecedented state of things in our Church. Evil principles appear to be strengthened in their league against us. Infidel, heretical, and schismatical influences are powerfully at work. There is also enlisted in the same ranks the interference of the merely worldly, careless to what interests they may be joined, provided worldly motives, principles, and agencies, may be brought to bear upon its views and designs. And in unhappy illustration of the infection which remaineth even in the regenerate, delusion hath so far come over members of the Church, that she hath within herself agencies tending to the same result, much more worthy of those that are without. Hence have resulted consequences truly painful to the pious heart. Many of the most sacred principles and requirements of the Gospel have been subjected to profane if not blasphemous treatment. Subjects essentially and solely connected with the Church of Christ—that kingdom which is not of this world—have been degraded into entire subservience to secular principles and views. Unblushing efforts have been made to array the sheep of Christ's flock against their pastors. The more faithful these, and the more influenced by holy independence of popular errors and delusions, the more have they been held up to scorn and ridicule, the meanness of which is lost, to the truly Christian mind, in its painful sense of their wickedness and impiety. Consequences most baleful to evangelical affections and morals have followed, the courtesies of society been violated, Christian friendships sacrificed, fraternal recognition denied, and the proprieties of relative station sadly overpassed.

We have too to lament, as the result of the unholy excitement which has been stirred up among us, an effort to weaken the hold and diminish the influence of the sound Catholic and evangelical principles, which, under God, have been so much blessed to the prosperity and to the efficient energies of our Church; an endeavor to cast suspicion on those whose holy and enlightened devotion to the Church has been marked with signal blessing; and a withholding of aid from the precious cause of the Gospel from the miserable influence of party jealousy.

These, brethren, are grievous evils for which the disturbers of our peace are responsible. Let us unite in humble, faithful prayer that they be not, as they justly may be, visited with sore judgments on our Church. By the blessing of God's heavenly grace, a remedy may be found in an enlightened knowledge, and a just appreciation, of the pure principles of the Gospel in their essential connection with Christ's Holy Catholic Church. These let my reverend brethren present to their people in their genuine Scriptural character, and urge with all the heart-stirring motives and sanctions which the Gospel presents.

That all this can best be done in entire conformity with the doctrines, discipline, and worship of our branch of the Catholic Church, I fully and unhesitatingly believe. To understand, appreciate, recommend, and act out, "the Church as it is," is the very best mode of strengthening and advancing those Protestant principles which are opposed to Papal errors,

and those Catholic principles which are opposed to all errors, whether Papal or Protestant, and thus of promoting the true interests of the blessed Gospel.

An important auxiliary to this end would be, my reverend brethren, a prudent and judicious but firm and decided effort to restore the practical observance of the Church's holy provisions for Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, and for hallowing all Sundays and Holy Days with the celebration of the Lord's Supper. To this end let the clergy labor; duly considering, however, that it must be expected that so great and blessed a change from the present influences of the god of this world, cannot be expected to be *suddenly* wrought, and that long, earnest, and faithful endeavors to produce, by the Divine blessing, an acquiescence in the *principle*, and a *gradual approximation* to its full development in *action*, must be expected first to exercise our Christian patience and hope.

And be ye not, dear brethren of the laity, backward in encouraging your pastors in such holy efforts to do full justice to the pious provisions, appointments, and requirements of the Church.

Our only hope, in all times of trial for the Church, is in the Lord our God. And surely we can have no truer refuge to Him than in that Church's holy communion with Him in her prayers and praises, and especially her Eucharistic Commemoration of the Lord's death, and the means which she is therein commissioned to administer of the grace and salvation which that death procured.

Let the claim, which is so generally put forth among us, to attachment to "*the Church as it is*," be truly *honest*, and her provisions will be gladly followed in all efforts to restore the unity and harmony which should subsist among the members of the *one Body of Christ*.

And let me, dear brethren, clergy and laity, especially press upon you the importance of ever looking upon the Church in its true and essential *spiritual* character. It has to do with spiritual and eternal things. However combined, in its militant state, this its great object may be with circumstances and relations of a secular character, *these are not of it*. They are but *appendages* connected with it. They are valueless for its genuine purposes, if separated from its spirituality. They are degrading and dangerous to it, and destructive of the Christian character and hopes of its members, if made paramount in their estimate and regard. Therefore do I earnestly and affectionately commend to your most serious study and consideration the true spiritual nature, requirements, and objects of the Church. Your thoughts, cares, and labors, must be mainly given to heaven and heavenly things, or you are unfit to duly appreciate the things of the Church of Christ. As this is the kingdom of heaven in its incipency, those whose conversation is not in heaven can have no just view of what rightly pertains to it, and may, by thoughtless interference, and much more by deliberately bad intent, in obtruding into its concerns, be guilty of blasphemy before God.

These things I would impress upon the clergy, for their right guidance in the instruction of their people, and upon all for their thorough and practical adoption.

Especially, dear brethren, do I exhort you to continue steadfast and unmoveable in the principles of the blessed Gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Be these your guide in the cultivation of individual character, in the discharge of domestic duty, in the regulation of social intercourse, and in all your civil relations and duties. In them all let your light shine before men in the affections, virtues, and good works of the Gospel—its purity, sanctity, and heavenly-mindedness. In no other way can you

do justice to the Church and promote the interests of pure and undefiled evangelical religion. This, too, is the armor wherewith you may be prepared to meet every opposition, open or cloaked, to the true doctrine and order of the Gospel. Let there then be no just imputation upon the clergy for unwillingness to *preach*, and none upon the laity for unwillingness to *receive*, the pure and unadulterated Gospel.

We have, brethren, but to hold fast the profession to which we were devoted in Baptism, and *all is safe*. When the world, the flesh, and the devil, are truly renounced by Christians, the Church will be secure; her sacred principles rightly appreciated; her holy duties faithfully discharged; her true spirit imbibed, and she, at unity in herself, be carried onward to the triumph which her Lord has in reserve for her here and in heaven.

To this end, brethren, be ye true to your solemn Christian league. Let heresy distract, schism deride, and worldliness neutralize, as they will. Be yours the steadfast mind and purpose to pursue the one straight path of Catholic faith, piety, and unity.

And that God's blessing may herein and in all things rest upon you, is the sincere prayer of

Your affectionate Pastor,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK,

Bishop of New-York.

NEW-YORK, January 27, 1844.

PASTORAL LETTER TO THE LAITY; OCCASIONED BY A RECENT APPEAL
TO THEM BY SOME OF THEIR NUMBER.

TO THE LAITY OF MY PASTORAL CHARGE:

Brethren, beloved in the Lord—Certain of your body have published and disseminated a document bearing their names, designed to place me before you as an arrogant assumer of prerogative beyond the just claims of my office, and therefore as one unworthy of your confidence, and obnoxious to the disrespect and suspicion of the community. I have no regret, on my own account, that they have thus frankly expressed themselves in their own names. My firm and fearless adoption and vindication of measures conscientiously deemed by me to be inseparable from the faithful discharge of my official obligations and responsibilities, have called forth manifestations of ill-will and hostility, both privately and publicly expressed, to which, from their anonymous and irresponsible character, or from other sufficient causes, I deemed it neither a demand of duty, nor a dictate of propriety, to make any answer. Now, however, I am accused before the Church and the world under names deserving respectful consideration; names too which give painful evidence that there has been a subjection of understanding to feeling, and of principle to passion, in quarters where I would have little expected it.

I am accused of a high-handed measure of tyranny, and of an unprincipled trampling on the rights of the laity, in the manner in which I treated the movement of the Hon. John Duer, at the close of our last Convention.

That movement was a censure upon my conduct in a matter of pastoral counsel to the clergy and people of my charge. The censure was contained in a document, signed, or to be signed, by that gentleman and others, and brought forward by him, without the accompaniment of any resolution, and evidently on the presumption that he, and they, and any others, had a right to spread upon the Minutes any document which they might see fit to pre-

paré, even without a resolution designed to test the sense of the Convention whether the liberty should be taken or not.

On principles which will be duly appreciated by all lovers of good order, I was instantly convinced that duty to the body over which I presided demanded of me to save it at once from such an outrage. I adopted the course marked out by duty.

I am blamed, however, for not having allowed an explanation. The whole matter having been an unjustifiable assumption of prerogative, that is, an assumption of the right of members to spread what they please upon the Minutes of the Convention, I could be faithful to my trust as the head of that body, laden with peculiar responsibility in the preservation of its good order, only by running the risk of refusing sanction to, or co-operation with, such disorderly proceedings. I could in no way recognize their admissibility.

I say *running the risk*: for upon the unhallowed principles which are so often allowed to govern human conduct, there might have been—I felt the possibility, but feared it not—an applying of the maxim which gives to power the control of right, and I might have been put down by acclamation. But God be thanked! I have a Diocese which fears Him and loves righteousness; which has ever been distinguished for Church knowledge, Church principles, and sound Church sympathies; and which had proved, years before, how surely it was to be found on the side of right, when disturbance is bred within it. The principles in which my distinguished predecessor, Bishop Hobart, so often found security and refuge in his trials for the Church's good, were still its characteristics; and I was nobly sustained; as appeared by manifestations immediately after the adjournment, and has ever since continued to appear by the most unquestionable tokens. These have made my Diocese dearer than ever to my heart. In the spirit of one of those noble sallies of conscious rectitude, and firm, pure, and unblenched purpose, which were so characteristic of Bishop Hobart, and which he manifested when, some thirty years ago, an effort was made in Convention to interfere with his Episcopal prerogatives, but was put down by what I trust will ever be the tone of New-York Churchmanship—I would say, brethren, I thank you for the sound principles and correct feelings you have manifested, and the right stand you have taken; but allow me frankly to say, that highly as I am gratified by your support, and truly strengthened as I feel by your concurrent opinions, I should, in any event, have persevered in my purpose.

But it may be said that room should have been allowed for explanation, which might have resulted in the offering of a resolution that the proposed document be entered on the Minutes, as a *protest*. The abstract right of protest it is unnecessary for me to discuss. Eminent civilians have sustained my course on the sound principle connected with that subject. I regard the chief question, however, as not that of the right of protest.

It is a principle of common justice, that when official prerogatives are conferred, and correspondent responsibility defined, by competent authority, rights are thus invested in the subject of those prerogatives and of that responsibility. That is, the person clothed with the prerogatives has a right to claim exemption from any other restriction in their exercise, than is involved in the prescribed mode and measure of responsibility.

Among the most generally acknowledged maxims of good government, is to be ranked that which makes especial application of this principle to those who are invested with peculiarly weighty official responsibilities;

and such as subject them, for the public good, to marked exposure to popular misunderstanding and ill-will. The protection of these in the conscientious and independent discharge of duty, has ever been a leading object in every well-regulated polity.

The Church has not neglected it. In consideration of the grievous weight of official responsibilities imposed upon her Bishops—often of the most delicate nature, involving points peculiarly obnoxious to misunderstanding and censure, and having connections and bearings, and leading to processes, which must necessarily be kept, at least for a time, from public observation—she has furnished them with securities in their official acts, which every sound and intelligent friend of social order and good government sees to be necessary to sustaining them in the righteous, fearless, and independent administration of their Episcopate.

Our Bishops are canonically responsible only by their amenability to trial on presentment by their respective Conventions, or by any three of their own order. Within this responsibility they are canonically secured and protected in the discharge of their duties. In no other way can they be called to account. Any judgment upon them, or censure of them, in other modes, is irregular, uncanonical, and an infringement upon their rights.

Such judgment and censure were attempted to be passed by the signers of Mr. Duer's document. I fear those gentlemen—and the remark applies in principle to those who have signed the late appeal to you—were little conscious of the extent to which they had suffered themselves to be drawn for the purposes intended by that paper. Their act was an impeachment of an individual before a tribunal to which he was not legally responsible, except so far as it might choose to exercise its right as a *presenter for trial*. But nothing was brought before it in this light. It was to be made the instrument, through its Minutes, of condemning the Bishop for abetting unchristian conduct and unsound doctrine. On what principle of justice, and of regard for equal rights, could these gentlemen ask of me to allow myself to be judged and censured by the Convention? Will they carry the doctrine on which their procedure was based into any connection that they may sustain with the administration of civil justice?

I trust you see, brethren, what is obvious to every sound Churchman, the correctness of the distinction between my position in the Convention as *Bishop of the Diocese*, and as *President of the Convention*. In my former capacity, it is both my prerogative and duty, as the chief pastor of the Diocese, to give to its council, and through that to my whole spiritual charge, such religious instruction, advice, and exhortation, as to me may seem right and proper. And this is the prerogative, brethren, which I said, and now say, and which I should be unworthy of your confidence, and of the oversight of you which the Holy Ghost has given me, if I should ever hesitate to say, I will assert, and maintain, and exercise, to the last extremity.

Such are the grounds, brethren, on which I aver that any resolution offered to the Convention going to impugn any of the Bishop's acts, whether in the discharge of his peculiar Episcopal prerogatives, or those of his pastoral office, except in the shape of a proposed impeachment of him for trial, is irregular, disorderly, uncanonical, and an invasion of his rights. The President of the Convention is therefore bound to refuse to receive it as utterly out of order.

Even in the matter of *advice*, so wisely cautious, conservative, and just are our Canons, that they provide each Bishop, in the *Diocesan Standing Committee*, with his proper advisers in his official transactions. The inter-

ference of Conventions, therefore, in this matter, directly or indirectly, is out of order. Here is another important security to our Bishops in the discharge of their functions. And while law thus prescribes and settles the mode and measure of their responsibility, it thus also, as before observed, secures their rights. All reaching beyond it in the latter, and all invasion of its bounds in the former, are necessarily of an unjust, oppressive, and radical character and tendency.

Nor is this principle, brethren, confined to Episcopal rights and prerogatives. It applies also to the clergy and laity. Suppose a proposition had come before the Convention impeaching the character and conduct of one of the clergy, in anything that he may have done, or any counsel that he may have given, in his pastoral capacity, or in consequence of anything that may have appeared in his parochial or missionary report, as spread upon the Journal; think ye that I would have allowed of its being entertained? No, surely, I would have reminded the Convention that they were not a judicial body, and had no right to pass judgment on the clergy of the Diocese, and would have fearlessly and utterly refused to subject any of my clergy to such an invasion of their rights.

Suppose, too, dear brethren of the laity—for the supposition comes fairly within the scope of the matter by which a few of your brethren have endeavored to array you against me—suppose that a member of the Convention should rise and offer a document for entry on the Minutes, designed to lade any of you with charges unfavorably affecting your character and standing as members of the Church; think you that I would so far forget your rights as to allow you to be thus arraigned before a body to which the Church has not made you responsible? I trust you know me too well to think so.

No, brethren, I am for law and order. I thank God that these, as provided in our branch of the Church, so happily accord with the great Catholic principles which our Divine Lord and Master has established for His Mystical Body. By these I wish to abide. These I commend to your serious consideration and study. These I would have you press home to your consciences in all that you do touching the Church's interests. These I would have you ever bear in mind with an especial reference to your *citizenship in heaven*, and your attaining to union *there* with the *Church of the first-born*. The world has invested the Church on earth with certain civil rights, and thus with a correspondent civil character. They are valuable in their way. But let them all perish, before a worldly spirit enthralls the Church, or one jot or one tittle of Christ's ordinances in her behalf is sacrificed.

I trust you now see, brethren, that the appeal which has been made to you is unfounded and unjust. It calls on you to condemn your Bishop in a way utterly unauthorized by the Church. I affectionately commend what I have now said touching it to your serious consideration. I think it will satisfy you—that is, those of you, not many I trust, who had doubts—that your Bishop has not transcended his powers, or forfeited his claim to the confidence which he has so long enjoyed from you; that he has but done his duty; and that there is no reason why the peace, good order, and godly quiet of the Diocese should be invaded, and the character which it has ever maintained as a sound branch of the Catholic Church be jeopardized, by anything connected with the parochial civil franchise which you are soon to be called to exercise. In this, as a *civil matter*, I would leave you entirely unrestrained. But as a matter connected with the Church of the living God, the Spouse and Body of Christ, and thus with your spiritual character and hopes, I must, as the pastor of your

souls, pray you to beware how you commit yourselves. Let the solemn fast of Passion Week be duly observed. Let the Holy Eucharist be received, in all Christian preparation of heart, on the Great Easter Festival. Then, seeking by special prayer God's guidance and blessing, go to the election of Wardens and Vestrymen, in the fear of God, and as a matter involving solemn Christian responsibilities. Let *spiritual* considerations and views preponderate with you; and lay deeply to heart the blessings which God's word pronounces on those who love, and seek, and pray for, the peace of Jerusalem; and its awful maledictions on those who foment and encourage therein disorder, contention, and strife.

And may God, dear brethren, be with you! Directed by His most gracious favor, and furthered with His continual help, may you—humbly, sincerely, and disinterestedly devoted to His glory, and the spiritual and eternal welfare of yourselves and your fellow-men—so dutifully and piously demean yourselves as members of the Church, exemplary in all its requirements, and finding your chief joy in the promotion of its spiritual interests, the enlarging of its borders, and the strengthening of its legitimate holy influences, that finally you may attain to the glory, honor, and immortality of its triumphant state in heaven!

God grant such blessings to you all, through Jesus Christ our Blessed Lord and Saviour!

From your affectionate pastor,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK,

Bishop of New-York.

NEW-YORK, *March 22, 1844.*

LETTER OF THE LAITY TO BISHOP ONDERDONK.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK, D. D.,

Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New-York:

WE, the undersigned, Laymen of your Diocese, having noticed an address to the Laity, the object of which seems to be to invite us to give a partisan character to the approaching elections of Wardens and Vestrymen in the several parishes, desire respectfully to assure you that we cannot allow ourselves to be parties to such a course of action. The ground upon which the recommendation of these gentlemen is based—is dissatisfaction at the decision of the Bishop in relation to a protest offered at the close of the late Convention against a portion of his annual address. We forbear to copy either the portion of the address objected to, or the protest, or to enter into any argument on a subject which has already been fully discussed.

We do not see that the advocates of dissent, in its various forms around us, are so quiet and unobservant of our doings that it will be wise in us to be at variance among ourselves. We are not ready to take part against our Bishop, and our several pastors, nor to repay their labor, their love, and their prayers, by introducing into the councils of the Church the unruly spirit of the world—its contentions and strife. We trust that we have so profited by their labors and prayers, that we love our Church, its privileges, order, and law.

We prefer to show the effect of our Christian nurture by other modes of action—not by contentious disputations about this fancied “right,” or that

"speculative opinion"—but by an orderly, decent and Christian-like walk in all things relating to the peace, prosperity, and purity of the Church of God.

David B. Ogden,
Isaac A. Johnson,
David Austen,
Nathaniel F. Moore
Walter Bowne,
Francis Dominick,
William Moore,
H. C. De Rham,
George Starr,
Peter Schermerhorn,
J. S. Carpenter,
John D. Ogden,
Ogden Hoffman,
Henry Laight,
D. A. Cushman,
William Betts,
Gabriel Wisner,
George Jones,
Henry H. Elliott,
Anthony J. Bleecker,
John Leonard,
Samuel G. Raymond,
D. E. Wheeler,
James Delancey Walton,
N. Bradner Smith,
A. R. Cushman,
Thomas W. Ogden,
J. Cramond Corp,
Joseph Curtis,
William H. Wisner,
T. D. Meigs,
William Van Hook,
Richard Ritter,
David H. Dick,
Robert W. Cairns,
John J. Brown,
S. M. Hitchcock,
Haynes Lord,
John C. Thatcher,
Thomas P. Cummings,
H. D. Aldrich,
Charles Carville,
G. N. Stebbins,
G. W. Burnham,
A. Dimock,
D. B. Turner,
George Draper,
David Hubbell Hoyt,
John H. Austen,
Clement C. Moore,
Gulian C. Verplanck,
Benjamin Aymar,
Murray Hoffman,
Abraham Ogden,
William Bard,
A. Norrie,
C. N. S. Rowland,
Samuel Jones,
John R. Livingston, Jr.,
James F. Depeyster,
Samuel W. Moore,
Robert D. Weeks,

William H. Hobart,
Jacob Walton,
Isaac G. Ogden,
Floyd Smith,
Theo. B. Bleecker,
Henry Ritter,
Edward Delafield,
Cornelius Oakley,
Samuel B. Romaine,
James Stewart,
William H. Lorton,
Morris M. Davidson,
James A. Sparks,
George C. Hance,
Edward Hodges,
John W. Thorne,
Charles J. Chipp,
Francis V. Many,
Christopher D. Varley,
Matthias Jayne Miller,
John P. Nesmith,
W. P. Bleecker,
Theron Wilber,
J. Wallace,
Vincent W. Many,
John L. Tiffany,
Joseph P. Pirsson, Jr.,
Henry Lawrence,
Pierre E. F. McDonald,
Theodore Mallaby,
Anthony L. Bleecker,
Alexander S. Leonard,
A. B. McDonald,
H. Meigs, Jr.,
N. G. Ogden,
Henry Brevoort,
William B. Ballow,
John Caswell,
Thomas S. Underhill,
James M. Cross,
James Van Norden,
Henry Trowbridge,
E. A. S. Haulenbeck,
John A. Moore,
H. A. Ten Broeck,
Robert D. Van Voorhis,
William Floyd Jones,
William R. Morrell,
James Warren, Jr.,
Henry Edey,
James Lawrence Moore,
Thomas Warrin,
John G. Morrell,
Frere Edey,
John T. B. Bleecker,
Francis Many,
John P. Atkinson,
I. Conner,
Edward Roome,
Samuel Wiswall,
E. B. Clayton,
Elam Bliss,

W. M. Godet,
Charles H. Clayton,
George S. Wood,
John W. Pirsson,
Alexander T. Clayton,
William Miner,
Robert Dickson,
John R. Lewis,
N. M. Stratton,
John Ogden,
John Blunt,
Benjamin A. Mumford,
Wm. H. Townsend,
John Grigg,
Robert Pettigrew,
Henry Wilson,
E. M. Brintnall,
Robert A. Sands,
Francis Smith,
Daniel O. Gibb,
Benjamin Sands,
George C. Miller,
John B. Seaman,
Thomas H. Newbold,
William Barnewall,
W. D. Waddington,
Robert L. Patterson,
Richard H. Ogden,
Theo. B. Satterthwaite.
J. B. Wood,
R. N. Wenman,
William H. Beare,
Edmund M. Young,
J. J. Davis,
G. F. Mott,
John Warrin,
Abner Cook, Jr.
John Richardson,
Henry Youngs,
J. Burges,
John B. Hunter,
Moses Smith,
Horace Everett,
Charles Osborn,
John V. Dixey,
C. R. Gilman,
H. Leroy Newbold,
H. C. Hobart,
Charles A. Lee,
William C. Dusenbury,
Charles D. Mead,
Henry Youngs, Jr.,
Charles J. Livingston,
Abraham L. Cox,
A. L. McDonald, Jr.,
Richard Van Dyke, Jr.,
James Reyburn,
Arthur Stewart,
Fanning G. Tucker,
B. T. Kissam,
William P. Powers,
Samuel Holmes,

Lewis Phillips,	Oscar Bullus,	Charles Davis,
William Techerley,	F. E. Ellison,	Edward Coles,
Theodore F. Phillips,	Edward Bullus,	Henry Suydam, Jr.,
John Read: Kearney,	Jotham Smith,	William G. Williston,
Charles Rhind, Jr.,	Robert U. Ward,	Robert Dickson,
George R. A. Ricketts,	Charles Taylor,	Edmund Moorewood,
Edward Hincken,	Robert Bayard,	Daniel Oakey,
John Hunter Graham,	Frederick J. Betts,	E. Boonen Graves,
Gouverneur Ogden,	Edward S. Innes,	Charles Walker,
Isaac Townsend,	Richard Sterling,	John A. F. Rachau,
Philip J. Forbes,	Gouv. Morris Wilkins,	A. O. Parmelee,
Joshua Jones,	John Battin,	John Ferguson,
L. M. Hoffman,	Frederick Sill,	Robert S. Goff,
J. Q. Jones,	J. Litton,	John H. Lyell,
George T. Strong,	William A. Duncan,	William Delafield,
William H. Jephson,	Edward W. Candee,	P. Reynolds,
Isaac Jones,	S. I. Husted,	Robert C. Wetmore,
Dayton Hobart,	William H. Phelps,	F. B. Cutting,
John D. Satterthwaite,	P. Ford,	F. R. Tillou,
J. L. Pell,	William E. Ross,	John J. Moore,
Martin Hoffman,	Henry Mason,	Richard Sill,
Henry I. Seaman,	J. W. Johnson,	George Tomes,
Abel T. Anderson,	James Guyon, Sen.,	Joseph Battin,
E. Houghton, Jr.,	H. S. Bedell,	John H. Swift,
Thomas C. Butler,	Isaac Seymour,	Edgar Brodhead,
Thomas Browning,	William H. Vermilye,	I. W. Fowler,
George Case,	James J. Jones,	Merit Welton,
T. J. Crowen,	Townsend Cox,	Nelson Jarvis,
Daniel Marvin,	Charles W. Carmer,	Theodore M. Tuthill,
Samuel J. Willis,	James Renwick, Jr.,	James E. Johnson,
Frederick A. Guion,	William Henry Priest,	Henry I. Seaman, Jr.,
Isaac O. Barker,	William R. Taylor,	David A. Edgar,
Alexander L. McDonald,	L. M. H. Butler,	Joseph Bedell,
E. Wainwright Butler,	William H. Bell,	Walter Betts,
W. Corp,	Joseph P. Pirsson,	Richard Whittingham,
Philip Dater,	G. E. Baldwin,	David S. Jones,
Harman Westervelt,	William E. Dunscomb,	Edmund H. Pendleton,
P. A. Schermerhorn,	Teunis Quick,	Isaac D. Vermilye,
R. J. Vanderwater,	C. F. Buhler,	Charles Beardsley,
John Ruthven,	Smith Barker,	Columbus Lane,
Edward G. Ludlow,	William N. Dyckman,	Isaac G. Ogden, Jr.,
William S. Popham,	John W. Mills,	J. W. Mitchell,
John Snowden,	Edward P. Torrey,	E. W. Laight,
Thomas L. Ogden,	William Castle,	William Bakewell,
Joseph W. Barker,	William Van Norden,	John S. Barker,
Wm. H. Harison,	Wm. C. Dayton,	Charles Fitz Wetmore.

NEW-YORK, March 29, 1844.

REPLY OF BISHOP ONDERDONK TO THE ABOVE.

TO DAVID B. OGDEN, CLEMENT C. MOORE, LL. D., AND OTHER LAYMEN,
WHO ADDRESSED TO ME A COMMUNICATION, DATED MARCH 29TH, 1844.

Brethren—In every department of duty peculiar satisfaction is attached to its conscientious discharge, when it is found to be approved by the wise and good. This is especially true of those duties which involve peculiarly heavy responsibilities, and peculiar exposure to misapprehension or misrepresentation by those who, from inability, unwillingness, or other cause, may fail properly to appreciate them. There are a delicacy, a sacredness, and a character and extent of consequences, attached to *pastoral functions* which invest *them* with a still more especial interest in this principle. Nor is its value at all abated when the course approved has been adopted without regard to man's opinion.

Therefore, my dear brethren, have the time and occasion of your address

added greatly to the gratification which I should always experience from evidence of your interest in the Church, of your approval of my course, and of the kind regard and sympathy of so many of the best laity of my Diocese, of those whom, for a series of years, it has been my privilege to rank among my most valued personal friends, and the most active friends of the Church, and of those with whom it was once my high satisfaction to think and act when troublous times agitated the administration of my great and good predecessor.

Your desire for peace, and determination to maintain it, no reasonable and just man who knows you will for a moment attribute to any other than a conscientious and independent sense of duty. The circumstances and important subjects connected with that desire and determination have long been familiar to you, and been thoroughly weighed by you. And I risk nothing in saying that they have found among you, in their investigation, a knowledge of the subject, a strength and clearness of understanding, an independence of principle, a virtuousness of purpose, a purity of Christian conscience, and a devoted and enlightened Churchmanship, greater than which is not to be found in any body of American citizens. I thank you, brethren, for the principles, feelings, and views, which you have manifested; and hesitate not to say, in the very best sense of the expression, that I feel *proud* of them.

Your address, so numerously signed, and *so* signed in a brief space of time, is a most welcome confirmation of the evidence I am perpetually receiving from all parts of the Diocese, that the great body of my brethren of the laity are very far from sympathizing with the spirit which would represent me as adverse to lay influence, and disposed to interfere with lay rights, in the Church. They *know* this is false. Neither in my language nor conduct have they observed anything to justify the aspersion. It is well known that I receive our ecclesiastical constitution as a great blessing handed down to us by our fathers, and have often expressed devout gratitude to God for having dealt so mercifully with this branch of His Holy Church, under the peculiarly disadvantageous, trying, and adverse circumstances which beset it when our country emerged from its long struggle against the oppressions of that wherein was seated the Church of our affections, but of the deadly hostility of the great mass around us; and which it was difficult for even ourselves to sever from the influence of political principles, views, and prejudices. Of the happy balance established between Episcopal, clerical, and lay influence in our ecclesiastical concerns, I have ever spoken with approbation, and with gratitude for constantly accumulating evidence that it works well. I should be unthankful, indeed, were not my feelings on this subject warmed by the recollection of the valuable counsel I have taken with pious, enlightened, and devoted laymen, of the important services they have often rendered to the Church in her Conventions, and of the noble stand which the laity of this Diocese took around their Bishop and clergy, when, in former years, an effort, similar to that now on foot was made to array the former against the latter; and by the assurances—let me gratefully add—now reaching me from every quarter, that they are still good and true. The insinuation that they are then only independent and honorable when they array themselves against their pastors, has too unworthy a source to entitle it to a moment's consideration.

I am aware, however, brethren, that you are often met with the remark, that all this was proved to be nothing worth in the matter touching Mr. Duer's procedure towards the close of the last Convention. Let us look a little into this.

Mr. Duer rose and stated in substance, that he had a matter to propound

which *he did not bring forward for discussion*. This sentiment, namely, *that he did not design to furnish material for debate*, was repeated by him more than once. I beg you to bear this particularly in mind.

He then read a document which he said had some names attached to it, and would probably have more. This document, no matter in what style expressed, brought against me the charge of *abetting, in strong terms of commendation, doctrines and a spirit not entitled to the confidence and support of Protestant Episcopalians*—in other words, *false doctrine, and an ungodly spirit*; and this in a way directly tending, not only to the corruption of my own Diocese, but also to the extensive diffusion of error throughout the Church.

The document having been read, Mr. D., after repeating that he did not present matter for discussion, but *simply desired the insertion of the document on the Minutes* with such signatures as were or might be attached to it, took his seat. What followed on my part has been denounced as a daring attempt to violate the rights of the laity.

It is entirely obvious, however, that this connection of the matter with the peculiar rights of the laity could not have been thought of by sensible men, if it were not to be rendered subservient to collateral purposes. It had in no just sense a peculiar reference to the laity. It is true, a lay member was the spokesman, but not in his *lay capacity*. He represented clergymen as well as laymen. The working up of the event into an especial attack by me upon the laity, is obviously gratuitous and unwarranted. No one, I presume, doubts that had the signers put forward a clergyman instead of a layman, he would have met with the same reception. The charge against me, therefore, of an infringement of lay rights, may safely, as it should in justice, be dismissed.

And now, what was the document?

It was not a paper fairly before the Convention. Mr. Duer could not have considered it such, or he certainly, as an intelligent man, would not have said time and again, that he did not offer it for discussion. He has vastly more than sense enough to be well assured that such a paper, *offered to the consideration of the Convention*, could not have failed to elicit warm and protracted debate. He meant what he certainly expressed, that it was to be *merely read and entered on the Minutes*. If this was not presuming upon a right, what was it?

Again. The gentleman thus acting as the representative of clerical and lay associates, has not a little just reputation for an accurate knowledge of the principles of parliamentary order and propriety. He, therefore, of course, knows that no subject is fairly before a deliberative body except in the shape of a resolution made and seconded. He offered no resolution; but simply read a document which he expressed a desire should go upon the Minutes without discussion, and therefore without any conventional action. It would be derogatory to his good sense, and his knowledge of the subject, to suppose that he considered the word "*request*" occurring towards the close of the document, as tantamount to a formal resolution, and, therefore, bringing the subject, in orderly manner, before the Convention. He knows that no written request is ever in order for action by a deliberative body unless a *resolution* is offered and seconded, either favorable to the request, or otherwise. He, therefore, must have intended that the document was, *of course, and without action by the Convention*, to be handed over to the Secretary for insertion on the Minutes.

Surely I was not wrong in construing the whole transaction into a *claim of a right*. The term "*request*" could not, for the reasons stated, have been intended by Mr. Duer *to bring the subject under the cognizance of the Con-*

vention. It was a courteous mode of signifying the demand of the signers. I was reminded of it when I read in a communication of a late number of *The Churchman*, an extract from Clarendon's *History of the Rebellion*. Speaking of the right of protest in the British House of Lords, he says, "It is an old custom and privilege of the House, that upon any solemn debate, whosoever is not satisfied with the conclusion and judgment of the House, may demand leave to enter his protestation, which must be granted." "Leave" is defined by Richardson to mean "permission, concession, sufferance." These terms necessarily suppose a right to grant or withhold the leave. And yet courtesy of expression led to that being called "leave" which was claimed by "*demand*," and which, it was understood, "*must be granted*." Very much like this is the meaning, if it has any meaning, of the term "*request*" introduced into a document which its propounder clearly supposed was to be received without discussion, and, therefore, as a matter of course. Is it too strong language to say that a *right* was herein assumed? If it is not, an assumption was put forward to which I could not, as President of the Convention, listen for a moment. In the very terms of the document, and by the express desire and intention of its propounder, it was shut out from the cognizance of the Convention. Nothing was in order before that body. All that the gentleman said—and he was patiently heard through the whole, and until he had taken his seat—presented nothing that was in order. On the contrary, the shape in which the protest was put, offered an indignity to the Convention by the supposition which it involved, that that body was prepared quietly to succumb to such a high-handed effort to exercise control over its Minutes. I felt that this indignity was offered, and that my brethren of the clergy and laity had a claim upon me to repel it.

But this was not the only duty which the emergency devolved upon me. The document thus offered, to find its way upon the Minutes through the ignorance, fear, or supineness of the Convention, contained an attack upon me. It accused me of earnest endeavors to disseminate false doctrine throughout my Diocese, and throughout the Church. I will not repeat, brethren, what is advanced in my late Pastoral Letter to the Laity of the Diocese, in proof of the unlawfulness and injustice of this. It gave to the document, besides its absence of all claim to the consideration of the Convention, the character of a personal matter between the gentleman introducing it—for he *named* no others—and myself. The Convention had nothing to do with it. An attack had been made by him upon me as Bishop of the Diocese. I repelled it in few words—words indeed of honest warmth, but not disproportioned, I trust, to the indignity thus rendered to my office.* My appreciation of the intelligence of the mover in the business would not allow me to imagine for a moment that he was unaware of the real character of the transaction, and of the position in which it placed him. He *did not intend*, as he *said* he did not, to propose a subject for discussion, that is, for the consideration of the Convention. He meant to *reach me* through a shorter process—a document which, under his management, the Convention, its President and Secretary, were to allow to go quietly on the Minutes, and thus to hold me up to public censure without even the form of a trial.

That gentleman would probably regard it as no compliment to have imputed to him the weakness of changing his ground, and thus owning the illegal character, as well as the failure, of his tactics. I could sup-

* See note on p. 13.

pose him to rise a second time for no other purpose than explanation, and such I clearly understood to be his object in rising. But it was a matter not in order before the Convention. It was one solely between him and myself. I was not willing to impose the farther consideration of it upon the Convention. Neither time nor place was fitting for this. Regarding it as a personal matter, in which I had been very wrongfully treated, my honest wish was either to let it there drop—for I have no desire to remember injuries—or to reserve further explanations for a more fitting time and place.

Although, however, this gentleman could not be justly suspected of a desire or endeavor to give such a shape to the business, as, bringing it within the Convention's rules of order, to acknowledge the disorderly nature of his first movement, yet, if his friends felt strong in the consciousness of right, there was abundant opportunity to present the subject in such a way that it might come in order before the Convention. What I have to say on this head shall be arranged under supposed cases.

Order having been restored, a resolution might, of course, have been submitted by any member.

If the resolution had been one of censure upon *The Churchman*, I would probably have reminded the Convention that the discussing of the merits of theological works hardly came within their constitutional and Canonical prerogatives; that the constituents of the lay members could hardly have contemplated that as an object for which they were appointed; and that it certainly appeared to be at variance with the spirit of our ecclesiastical system, which might, in many ways, be shown to be adverse to the ordinary introduction of doctrinal discussions into our Conventions. I should therefore have been justified in pronouncing the resolution out of order, subject of course to an appeal to the Convention. It is not improbable, however, that I would have waived this, and left the question to the direct decision of the House.

If the resolution had embodied, in form or substance, the matter of Mr. Duer's protest, so far as it involved an accusation of doctrinal unfaithfulness on my part, I should at once have declared the resolution out of order, for reasons which I have laid before the Church. If an appeal had been made from my decision, I should, of course, have taken the question on that appeal. Had it been sustained, I should—I hope respectfully and kindly, but certainly conscientiously and firmly—have signified my utter protest, as Bishop of the Diocese, against so high-handed an infringement of my rights as any censure, save in the shape of Canonical impeachment, upon my official acts; declared my determination in no way to sanction so flagrant a violation of our ecclesiastical compact, and therefore not to be present in any deliberations or acts connected with it; given fair and honest warning that I should pay no respect to any action by which my rights should be thus invaded; and left the Convention, never again to appear in it, until it had recovered its character for Christian justice and Church order. To my Diocese, however, I should of course continue to do my duty as God might give ability, though having to follow my Master and His first ministers in the midst of an unjust and persecuting generation.

I need not say, brethren, how near, for the purpose of illustrating a principle, I have carried supposition to the utmost bound of possibility. Of anything bearing the most distant resemblance to such a case I have not the least fear. I am not so unjust to my beloved Diocese. Its Christian and Church-like character forbids this. My understanding and my heart unite to assure me that there is no danger of it. The spiritual pastors of the

Diocese are too true to their sacred obligations. Its laity are too thoroughly imbued with the principles and spirit of the beloved brethren whom I now particularly address, and the multitudes of others who I know, sympathize with them entirely. May God bless them all, remember for good their devotion to His cause, and increase and multiply upon them those influences of His HOLY SPIRIT, whereby they may truly love and serve the Church, and be carried onward, in the cherishing of its holy faith, and the practical manifestation of its sober and efficient piety, to its eternal rewards in heaven!

From your faithful, affectionate, and grateful Pastor,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK,

Bishop of New-York.

NEW-YORK, *Monday in Easter Week,*
April 8, 1844.

PASTORAL LETTER ON THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1844.

TO THE CLERGY AND BRETHREN OF MY SPIRITUAL CHARGE:

Dear Brethren—It is well known to some of you that when, a few years ago, differences and agitations, long excluded from our Diocese, were unhappily introduced into it, threats were made, in reference to my real or supposed connection with them, of action against myself, having in view nothing short of my official destruction. These were repeated from time to time, as occasions were taken for opposition to my friends or myself. As our late Diocesan Convention, and the late General Convention, approached, and during the latter, those threats were renewed, with the obvious design of producing an influence on the action of that body. While I was engaged in my duties there, it came to my knowledge that plans had been formed, and untiring means adopted, having in view the object of the threats to which I have alluded. The most industrious efforts were made to injure me by false reports, and by statements which I was not allowed to see. The same course, I understood, was pursued in this city.

I have expressed a desire for a Canonical investigation of the case; and know you too well, dear brethren, to doubt for a moment that you will do me the justice to suspend your opinion until the result of that investigation is known.

Commending you to the blessings of God's providence and grace, and soliciting, now and at all times, your prayers in my behalf, I am, dear brethren,

Your affectionate Pastor,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK,

Bishop of New-York.

NEW-YORK, *Oct. 25, 1844.*

P. S.—The above was prepared the day after my return to New-York, but its publication has been withholden a few days by the advice of judicious friends.

B. T. O.

TREATMENT OF BISHOP ONDERDONK IN THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.

On the first day of last October [1844] I left home for the city of Philadelphia, to attend to my duties as a member of our General Ecclesiastical Convention, which was to meet in that city. The Convention of my own Diocese had just closed its annual session. It had been unusually large, and distinguished by a very marked degree of unity and harmony. The circumstances under which it assembled, were such as to render its proceedings a very special proof of the kindest feelings of confidence and affection on the part of the clergy and laity of the Diocese, toward their Bishop. The reports laid before it, and there made to me, gave strong evidence of the divine goodness in blessing the Diocese with a large measure of spiritual and temporal good.

Rejoicing in the consolation and encouragement thus afforded, I repaired to the General Convention, and gave myself to its duties in a spirit of humble and grateful devotion to the Church. Soon, however, it became manifest, from the deportment of several of my Right Reverend brethren, that they had somewhat against me. They said nothing. Not a word did I hear of any rumors or accusations against me; not a word of a brother's anxiety to be set right; not a word of fraternal warning, caution, or admonition. Cold, repulsive, discourteous manner, told a dark and uncertain tale on which Christian converse might and should have thrown light.

Some six or seven days after the opening of the Convention, when the House of Bishops were about coming to order, Bishop Meade approached me, and suggested that I had better leave the House. I expressed my surprise, and asked why he made the suggestion. He said he could not explain the reasons, but again urged me to absent myself. On my repeating my surprise at a proposition so dark and suspicious, and so little comporting with the courtesy of a gentleman, the duty of a friend and brother, and the proprieties of a Christian, he said that if I continued in the House my feelings might be hurt. This increased my surprise, and I *demand*ed of him his reasons for so strange a procedure. He hesitated about giving any explanation. I warmly expostulated with him on the injustice and wickedness of the course he was pursuing. At length, as if reluctantly compelled, he said that there were reports unfavorable to my character, respecting which he wished to take the counsel of the Bishops. I felt what I trust was just indignation, and expressed myself to this effect:—Now my course is clear. I will not shrink. I will remain at my post. If any man has aught against me, let him look me in the face, and say what it is. I also spoke strongly of his unworthy design of inducing me to withdraw, that he might, in my absence, make my character and conduct the subject of discussion in the House of Bishops. He replied, *Not in the House of Bishops, but before the Bishops informally!!* This unholy evasion was the subject of severe remarks; but I trust not more severe than it deserved. I asked what were the charges against me? He said he was not at liberty to tell; and there our conversation ended. This was all I ever heard from this brother of his having aught against me until he was about to become one of my presenters for trial. Yet I have good evidence that Bishop Meade had, for years, been speaking against me, and contributing towards public rumor to my prejudice.

After some time, Bishop Meade came to me again, and said, in substance, *You were right. I will have nothing more to do with the matter. THEY MUST ATTEND TO THEIR OWN BUSINESS.* These last words satisfied me that he had been acting in concert with others. And when we consider the darkness and secrecy with which *he acted his part*, how can an honorable

and Christian man think otherwise than that he was connected with a *conspiracy against me!*

On, I think, Monday, October 14th, the Presiding Bishop, in his place in the House of Bishops, held in his hand a paper, of which a copy had been previously sent to me, directed to him as President, which he asked if it was the pleasure of the House to have read. Its purport was demanded by one of the Bishops. Bishop Chase, the Presiding Bishop, said that it related to the character and conduct of the Bishop of New-York, and he asked me if I wished to retire. Of course, so extraordinary an inquiry was answered in the negative. Earnest remonstrance was made by several of the Bishops against the propriety of such a paper having been brought into the House, and against its being received, opened, or read; because it was uncanonical and disorderly to bring a Bishop's character under the official notice of his brethren, except in the mode pointed out by law. The ultimate result was a refusal to receive the document, and its being returned unopened to the persons who had presented it. I need hardly say, that I felt myself deeply injured by the Presiding Bishop in his allowing himself to be an agent in so irregular and unjust a procedure, as bringing such a document into the House.—*Statement of Facts*, January, 1845.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE BISHOP AND THE PRESENTERS.

LETTER OF THE PRESENTERS.

NEW-YORK, November 5, 1844.

Right Reverend and Dear Brother—During the investigation of the painful charges which have been laid before us, affecting the purity of your conduct, a short Pastoral Address to the clergy and laity of your Diocese [see p. 70] has been handed us, which leads us to suppose, that notwithstanding the clear definition of the position in which we now stand in relation to yourself, made in your presence in the House of Bishops, you misunderstand that position, and assume it to be connected with persons and circumstances with which it has no concern whatever.

These charges, you may remember, were laid before the House of Bishops in a memorial purporting to come from two highly respectable clergymen, and three equally respectable laymen of the Church, and all holding the responsible office of Trustees of the General Theological Seminary. Of these memorialists, two or three had been solemnly charged by the Diocese of South Carolina to investigate rumors affecting the welfare of the Seminary; and in the course of that investigation, these charges against your moral purity had come before them in such a responsible shape, that they felt compelled, by a sense of duty, to lay them before the House of Bishops as Visitors of the Seminary. You may remember likewise, that upon the appearance of that memorial, an excited discussion was likely to arise respecting the right of the Bishops to receive such a paper coming in such a shape, when one of us, your brethren, and in your presence, submitted certain questions determining the position of any three Bishops, who might entertain for presentment the charges of the said memorialists. These questions laid over for a whole day, during which the propositions of the Bishop of Western New-York, respecting alterations in the Constitution of the Foreign and Domestic Missionary

Society, were discussed; and upon the next morning a full and free discussion was had in your presence, you yourself taking part in the conversation, in which these points were considered as combining the views of the House of Bishops:

1. That the three Bishops presenting occupied very much the position of a grand jury, who are to take care that the evidence submitted to them was such as to make out a *prima facie* case against the accused.

2. That these Bishops should not be considered justifiable in presenting, except upon the testimony of responsible persons, delivered before themselves personally, or duly witnessed before some civil magistrate qualified to administer an oath.

3. That the acts charged, or if constituting a sequence, some of them at least, should come within a period of time not barred by an equitable statute of limitations.

Under these circumstances, and with these views, we, as your brethren, and with the purpose of shielding you from rumors which were deeply affecting your character, and preventing a public exposure of you upon *ex parte* evidence, as well as for the protection of the House of Bishops against the imputation of refusing to listen to charges against any one of its body, have been placed in the painful position which we now occupy in relation to yourself. We can assure you that we have none other than the kindest feelings towards you as a man, and trust in God that you will be enabled to answer to the satisfaction of the House of Bishops the charges which we shall feel bound, as things now appear, to present against you to the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

From your Pastoral, you seem to labor under another misapprehension, which we hasten to remove. And that is, that there has been any secrecy in this matter, or any hunting after evidence on our part. Every paper received by us in Philadelphia was frankly and freely read by one of our number to Bishop Ives, Dr. Wainwright, and Dr. Berrian, with the understanding that their contents should be communicated fully to yourself, and with the promise which we now perform, that no final action should be had in this case, until you and your friends had been advised of the same. Since our arrival in New-York, we have not been collecting, but receiving and sifting testimony; and by this caution have been enabled to clear up, satisfactorily to ourselves, one of the most disagreeable of the charges which had been laid before us. We are compelled, however, to state, that enough remains, as will appear from the articles accompanying this communication, together with the names of the witnesses, to render it incumbent upon us to lay the matter before the House of Bishops, that you may, God helping you, forever put at rest these charges against your moral purity, or else receive humbly the punishment which may be meted out to you in the premises.

We sincerely trust that you will not misconceive our motives, nor misunderstand our course of action. Our desire is, we repeat it, for your sake and the Church's sake, to bring out the truth, and nothing but the truth, and to pray you to help us in it, that your character may stand before the world, as that of a Christian Bishop should, blameless and spotless.

We have delayed making this communication until we ascertained, satisfactorily to ourselves, that it was necessary to trouble you at all upon this painful matter.

And now commending you to God, we remain, very sincerely and affectionately,

Your brethren in the Episcopate,

WILLIAM MEADE, D. D.,
JA. H. OTEY,
STEPHEN ELLIOTT, JR.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S REMARKS.

The above letter was accompanied by a document containing—not copies of the affidavits, which I had particularly desired to see, and the granting of the request to see which had been guaranteed by Bishop Elliott's promise and pledge, but—the charges intended to be embodied in the presentment; and a verbal message that they would receive any communication from me *the next morning at ten o'clock.**

This was the only redemption of Bishop Elliott's repeated pledge, that before the affidavits were used for the purpose of presentment, any request should be granted for my friends and myself to see or hear them, with opportunity of offering to the presenters explanations or counter-statements. My friends in this city were patiently and respectfully waiting, in sure expectation of an honorable redemption of the pledge, when I was told, *at ten o'clock at night*, that we were allowed *until ten o'clock the next morning!* I need not say how useless was this offer, and how utter the fallacy of any distinction that may be imagined between the sending of this letter and document, and the serving upon me at once of the presentment.

Thus it appears, that although it had been boastfully vaunted, as early as about the middle of October, that proof of guilt was in possession sufficient for my official destruction, and was deposited with Bishop Elliott, with whom Bishops Meade and Otey were soon connected, yet was it not until November 5th that I was apprized of their readiness to proceed. Meanwhile, if I am rightly informed, they gained no new affidavit, nor could aught be found against me for a period more recent than nearly two years and a half. Ample opportunity, however, had thus been afforded to my enemies for prosecuting their designs. Nor was it unimproved by them. Every effort was made to ruin me in the estimation of the Church and the world. The most barefaced falsehoods were circulated verbally and through the press. Through the influence of the latter, my character and conduct were subjected to the most scurrilous abuse in all parts of the country; an evil which, it is obvious, pampering as it does the basest and most malignant, but not on that account the least welcome, passions and affections of the natural heart, it is hard and toilsome for virtue and integrity to arrest.

Such was the cruel treatment to which I was subjected by the delays of the presenters, and the abominable practices against me which those delays encouraged; when, as appears by the issue, *their* work could have been as well done at least a fortnight earlier. No one need be told how much, through press and tongue, a fortnight may accomplish, in the work of evil-speaking, lying, and slandering, when an aggravated case is sought to be made out, and the ruin of an obnoxious individual is the object.—*Statement of Facts*, January, 1845.

* At this time two of my presbyters called on the presenting Bishops, and remonstrated with them on the shortness of the time allowed. They offered another day. So evident, however, was their *haste* to make up for *past delay*, and indeed so incompetent even the additionally allowed time to answer the purpose originally designed by my request and Bishop Elliott's promise—seeing that my past ignorance of the particular charges had allowed me no opportunity of preparation—that the real character of the procedure was not thus materially altered.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S REPLY TO THE PRESENTERS.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND BISHOPS MEADE, OTEY, AND ELLIOTT :

Brethren—Your communication of yesterday was handed to me last evening.

You are mistaken in supposing that in what I say of "plans, means, and efforts," in my short address to the clergy and people of my charge [see page 70], I had any reference to yourselves. I referred to what I understood to be the movements of the two clergymen and three laymen of whom you speak, and of others prompted by them; and especially the plans and efforts for obtaining the presence and services of the Rev. James C. Richmond, a brother who, for whatever erroneous course he may pursue, is probably more entitled to pity than blame; and who, I may observe here, not a month before the meeting of the General Convention, had called on me, and expressed a warm desire to return to my Diocese, that he might *stand by me* in my troubles, and *be my friend*. Whether, however, they who make use of such a one are equally exempt from blame, I leave to sound principle and correct feeling to determine.

In what I say of not being allowed to see statements made against me, I frankly confess that I do refer, in part, to Bishop Elliott. He had the papers. He knew I wished to see them. He knew I asked to see them. He knew I desired an interview with him respecting them. He refused both to let me see them, and to converse with me about them. I consider what was at length done in reading them to some of my friends by no means an equivalent to the act of justice and brotherly regard which I asked. It was yielded, as I was told, not without difficulty. The like was refused to others of my friends who earnestly sought it; and in the measure and mode in which it *was* conceded, I was not allowed the common justice of selecting the friends to whom that would be granted as a boon which was equitably due. I have no fault to find with the choice which was made; but I contend that the choice should have been *my own*. In this matter of refusing me a sight or hearing of the accusations brought against me, and leaving me to gather a knowledge of them from the impressions made on, and the recollections had by, friends not of my own choosing, Mr. Trapier, and those associated with him, are connected in my mind with Bishop Elliott; and I am not aware in what exact measure they are respectively to be held responsible.

Your view of the opinions expressed by the Bishops, touching the true character and relations of presenters, is, according to my recollection, not strictly accurate. It appears to me that it was generally understood that presenting Bishops sustained a position differing in many important respects from presenters or prosecutors in civil or criminal courts. While their relation to the Church is that of jealous guardians of its purity, good repute, and interests, they should also sustain to the accused the relation of friend and brother, bound to him by very near sympathies, and acting as a shield and defence for him against the malice of the world, and the persecutions of public rumor and accusation. Hence I certainly gathered it to be the general opinion of the Bishops, that the fraternal relations between the accused and those who may move in the matter of his presentment, were not to be sacrificed; but that *he* should expect, and *they* should concede, all opportunity on his part to place his explanations and counter-statements in the opposite scale to that in which the assertions of his accusers were cast, for such consideration as to those his Episcopal brethren may seem right in the full acting out of their solemn obligation so to

minister discipline as not to forget mercy, and be so merciful as not to be too remiss.

It is a matter of unfeigned surprise to me, that in your enumeration of the opinions of the Bishops, relative to the character, relations, and duties of presenters, you should have omitted an item of very great importance, included in Bishop Elliott's able and clear remarks on the subject. I allude to *malicious motive*. He emphatically stated this as a matter to be looked into before any Bishops should consent to be presenters. I have heard it spoken of by brother Bishops as evidence of his high, honorable, and just principles and views. How could you have omitted it? It necessarily supposes *an opportunity to the accused of being heard*.

In the present case, brethren, if the opportunity were given which Bishop Elliott's repeated pledge was justly deemed to secure, I assume that a clear case of malicious motive may be made out; that other views than regard for the purity of the Church may be shown as lying at the foundation of this movement; and that a well-defined conspiracy, not, it is to be feared, falling short of our own house in its comprehensiveness, may be made manifest.

Your expressions, brethren, of kindness and friendship, are very well. There are a practical extent and operation, however, in these virtues, enforced by sound morals and Christian principle, which require something more than words as evidence of the truth and sincerity of the profession of them. Now, what evidence have I had in reference to yourselves? For the last few days of my continuance in Philadelphia, the conduct of each of you towards me was the reverse of fraternal, friendly, or courteous; and anything but indicative of your being governed by the essentially just maxim of esteeming a man innocent until he is proved guilty. It was very obvious that you had prejudged my case, and secretly pronounced me guilty. Of Bishop Elliott I sought a brotherly interview, which he denied me. Since your arrival in this city, not one of you has been near me. You have been among my people, preached to them, to a certain extent sought their money for your Dioceses; used the sanction which myself gave you for doing so; and yet not paid me the ordinary official courtesy of a call at my residence. You have had your ears open to all the gossip and scandal which men reducing themselves to the low caste of informers and panders could seek out and scrape together for the use of my inveterate enemies. It being thus known that there were Bishops here who made it their business to receive, examine, and sift, such testimony, has done more to bring public scandal on the Church than all else connected with this business, and has given an intensity of malignant effort to men desperately set upon my ruin. You have thus been the means of creating the public rumor which is, I understand, an assumed ground of action for the defence and purifying of the Church. Thus have you contributed to make me, and through me our office, our Church, and our religion, a scoffing to the profane: and done not a little to aggravate my wretchedness, and help the purpose of my enemies to bring on my ruin. Contrast with all this what you say of friendly and Christian feelings towards me.

You speak of having "been enabled to clear up satisfactorily one of the most *disagreeable* of the charges which had been laid before" you. What this is, you say not. Report, before I left Philadelphia, and since I came home, has said that you were in possession of an affidavit charging me with presence in a house of ill-fame. The report, as was to be expected, spread widely. As was also to be expected, it swelled in character until the *act* was magnified into a *habit*. As my *friends*, you were bound to give me at once the name of my false accuser, that he might be summarily

prosecuted for his villainy. Is it possible that this is the "disagreeable" thing to which you so coolly advert?

Had you allowed me the opportunity which Bishop Elliott's pledge made my right, I might have enabled you to clear up other charges against me.

The subject of your professed kind and friendly feelings toward me is inseparably connected in my mind with peculiar circumstances relating to two of your number. Of Bishop Meade I was asked, two or three days ago, whether I considered him my friend. The question was put by a gentleman who had been in Virginia, and who said that his doubts on the subject were the result of what he had there heard, I think from the Bishop himself. I cannot but connect this with his present position, and particularly with his effort, at the late General Convention, to get rid of me, that he might, in my absence, make my character the subject of remark among my brethren.

Of Bishop Otey, too, I am compelled to speak, in this connection, though with great pain. At different times an inmate of my family, much beloved and esteemed by them, he has not now called to see us. He has avoided all intercourse with me. He has, as one of you, been accessible to all sorts of stories against me, and such as he must know my enemies design to push to my ruin and degradation, and to the wretchedness and penury of my family. He can yet find it in his heart to give me no chance of explanation; and still unite in professions of brotherly regard and Christian kindness.

Had Bishop Elliott's pledge, brethren, been redeemed in its true spirit and meaning, I could have added various considerations not unmeet to have been regarded by you in connection with the question of presentment. So obvious, however, is it that your minds are set, and your determination formed, that I cannot but regard such considerations as useless. I leave the whole matter in your hands; willing to meet any investigation which you may think fit to institute.

Deeply grieved at what I cannot but think the unjust and ungenerous treatment which I have received at your hands, I still beg you to be assured of the continued prayers for your individual welfare, and for a blessing on your official functions, of

Your brother in Christ,

BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK.

NEW-YORK, November 6, 1844.

ANSWER OF PRESENTERS.

NEW-YORK, November 9, 1844.

Right Reverend and Dear Brother—Yours of the sixth instant, received by us on the evening of the eighth, requires only a few words in reply.

We consider the promise made by one of our number in Philadelphia as fulfilled in letter and in spirit by our communication of the fifth instant. We reiterate what we stated in that communication, that we have acted throughout this whole matter, in a frank and generous manner to you and your friends, and that there has been no secrecy, at any moment, in regard to our position, or the evidence received by us. We regret to perceive in your reply that the motives of our action are questioned; but in this stage of the business we deem it inconsistent with our duty to enter upon any discussion of that matter. We trust that the conduct of the trial will be such as to satisfy you that our single desire is to bring out the truth, and nothing but the truth, and settle these painful charges one way

or the other. As the case is now in the hands of the Presiding Bishop, we must decline any further correspondence upon these matters.

Reciprocating your prayers and good wishes,

We remain your brethren in the Church,

WILLIAM MEADE,
JAMES H. OTEY,
STEPHEN ELLIOTT, Jr.

PASTORAL LETTER ON THE PRESENTMENT.

TO THE CLERGY AND PEOPLE OF MY SPIRITUAL CHARGE :

Brethren—The object of the threats to which I referred in my recent letter to you, [see p. 70] has been in a measure accomplished. After several weeks given to diligent hunting up of causes of accusation against me, a few specifications, all assigned to years gone by, have been deemed sufficient to warrant the further and more formal investigation of a trial. Your Bishop, therefore, is now the subject of a Canonical Presentment.* My humble trust, through Christ, in Him of whom the inspired word saith, “the righteous Lord loveth righteousness: His countenance will behold the thing that is just;” affords me a consolation, support, and confidence, for which I cannot be sufficiently thankful.

Never, dear brethren, could I, with clearer conscience, and never with purer and more heartfelt devotion, than now, minister among you. In my present position, however, an avoidance of public ministrations may be reasonably expected. I submit. For the present I suspend all Public Services. Believe me, however, that on that very account, my prayers in your behalf will be the more frequent and earnest. This is a privilege and consolation of which, thank God, my enemies cannot deprive me; and that I shall be the subject of your faithful fervent prayers is an assurance full of comfort to the heart of

Your affectionate Pastor,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK,

NEW-YORK, November 11, 1844.

Bishop of New-York.

VERDICT OF MAJORITY OF COURT.

THE undersigned, being the majority of the Court of Bishops, convened under the authority of the 3d Canon of A. D. 1844, passed in the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, to try the Presentment addressed to the Bishops of the said Church by the Right Reverend William Meade, Bishop of the Diocese of Virginia, the Right Reverend James Hervey Otey, Bishop of the Diocese of Tennessee, and the Right Reverend Stephen Elliott, Jr., Bishop of the Diocese of Georgia, against the Right Reverend Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk, Bishop of the Diocese of New-York—do hereby declare that the said Court, having fully heard the allegations and testimony of the parties, and deliberately considered the same, after the parties had withdrawn, did declare respectively, whether, in their opinion, the accused was guilty or not guilty of the charges and specifications contained in the Presentment, in the order in which they are set forth; and the undersigned, being a majority of the said Court, were thereupon found to have concurred in pronouncing that the said Right Reverend Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk is guilty of the first, the second, the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth articles, containing the charges and specifications therein expressed of the said Presentment, as by reference to the same will more fully appear; and do, thereupon, declare him guilty of immorality and impurity, as the same is charged in the Presentment, and set forth in the said specifications.

* The Presentment and Canonical summons to attend the trial were served upon Bishop Onderdonk on November 9, 1844.

In testimony whereof, the said majority have hereunto set their hands, at the session of the said Court, holden in the city of New-York, on the 2d day of January, A. D. 1845.

PHIL. CHASE,*
Bishop of Illinois, and Sen. Bishop and President of the Court.
 THOS. C. BROWNELL,
Bishop of the Diocese of Connecticut.
 JOHN H. HOPKINS,
Bishop of the Diocese of Vermont.
 B. B. SMITH,
Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Kentucky.
 CHAS. P. McILVAINE,
Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Ohio.
 LEONIDAS POLK,
Bishop of the Diocese of Louisiana.
 ALFRED LEE,
Bishop of the Diocese of Delaware.
 JOHN JOHNS,
Assistant Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Virginia.
 MANTON EASTBURN,
Bishop of the Diocese of Massachusetts.
 J. P. K. HENSHAW,
Bishop of Rhode Island.
 GEO. W. FREEMAN,
Missionary Bishop for Arkansas, &c.

* The foundation of Bishop Chase's hostility to Bishop Onderdonk has already been pointed out (See p. 47), and it began to be manifested when Bishop Chase, eager to become the accuser of his brother, published a pamphlet charging Bishop Onderdonk with bringing alarming evils upon the Church, by the ordination of the Rev. Arthur Carey. Bishop Onderdonk justly complained of this censure of his *official acts*, and demanded that Bishop Chase, together with Bishops Hopkins and McIlvaine, who had united as his accusers before the world, should either virtually withdraw their charges or present him for heresy (See p. 54.) This latter alternative they did not dare to accept; but, as the reader will have observed, they, in connection with his other enemies, attained their object by trying him, at a subsequent period, for "immorality and impurity," while they really meant "Puseyism," and "Tracts for the Times." Bishop Chase, however, answered Bishop Onderdonk's complaint and challenge in the following extraordinary manner:

"I did not think I was injuring you personally or officially, when I wrote my 'Caveats' against Popery in the pamphlet alluded to. As to the crime of blaming a Bishop for his official acts (if it be a crime), I had your example to lead me to it. When I was in England in 1824, trying to obtain funds for an institution of sacred learning in my then Diocese of Ohio, you wrote a much thicker *pamphlet* against me, and sent that pamphlet across the Atlantic, even to London, that great city, wherein it was distributed with much zeal and great numbers among the Bishops, and Lords of the Council, Universities, and clergy, and people at large, so that if the good God had not raised up friends who thought differently from yourself, in a way almost miraculous, my cause would have been ruined, and myself sent back in disgrace. You were then a 'Presbyter,' and signed your pamphlet as such. You therein publicly attacked me, a Bishop; and in no measured terms, held up my conduct to public contempt."—*Churchman*, March 9, 1844.

To attempt to institute an analogy, as Bishop Chase has done, between his conduct and that of "Presbyter," is, to say the least, unfair and worthy of censure, even supposing the Bishop to have been ignorant of the fact, that Bishop Onderdonk's pamphlet was written in reply to an attack made on Bishop Hobart, by the vestry of Christ Church, Cincinnati, in behalf of Bishop Chase. Perhaps, however, the analogy may be excused on the ground that Bishop Chase did not see that his going to England to collect funds was not an Episcopal act. As to the merits of this controversy, it should be enough to say, that a majority of the Bishops had, previous to the departure of Bishop Chase, expressed to him their disapprobation of his proposal to apply to the English Church for the funds required to establish his favorite local institution of learning. In addition to the adverse opinions of Bishops White, Hobart, Moore, Kemp, Croes, and Brownell, respecting his scheme, he was also opposed by the Standing Committee of the General Theological Seminary, and the Board of Directors of the Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, both of which bodies passed resolutions conformable to the views advanced by the majority of the Bishops to whom, as before intimated, he had unsuccessfully applied for letters of approbation. *And still he went!*

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S SOLEMN PROTEST.*

The following paper, read by Bishop Onderdonk in the Court of Bishops, January 3, 1845, "offering his reasons in excuse or palliation of the sentence to be passed" upon him, though doubtless familiar to his old friends will be new to many into whose hands this pamphlet may fall:—

Right Reverend Fathers and Brethren—By the decision of a majority of your Right Reverend body, I am pronounced "guilty" of several charges which have been preferred against me; and in conformity with the Canonical provision, I am now before you to declare whether I have aught to say in excuse or palliation.

Human courts, Right Reverend Brethren, can take cognizance only of outward actions. It is by these I am to be righteously judged by you, or by any human tribunal: for God alone seeth the heart. The acts laid to my charge are declared by a majority of your Court to be proved: nor does it now become me to question the truth of your decision—but in excuse, or palliation, I hereby protest, before this Court, and before Almighty God, my entire innocence of all impure or unchaste intention.

It is the intention, Right Reverend Fathers and Brethren, which constitutes guilt; but it is not every outward act that interprets the inward intention. There are, indeed, acts, such I mean as adultery, incest, fornication, which are undoubted proofs of indwelling impurity; and these acts are wisely and mercifully defined, and forbidden under adequate penalties by human laws. Such acts are justly punished by human tribunals, because they have been previously defined and prohibited; and they are safely punished by human tribunals, because they are unquestioned proofs of guilt, and may be adjudged so to be without danger of encroaching on the rights of man, or the prerogative of God. But the acts for which I am arraigned before you are not of this description. They are of a new and unprecedented class for judicial cognizance; and I further plead that they are not, necessarily, proofs of impurity, and that, therefore, they are not safely punishable; that they are not defined and forbidden by pre-script laws, and that, therefore, they are not justly punishable by any human tribunal.

As the acts laid to my charge are not of that decisive character as to be safe matters of judicial cognizance, so neither are they of that number in their kind as to be proofs of habitual impurity. Habitual impurity of thought, such as to condemn a man before God, may exist without showing itself in gross crimes; yet surely it can never be proved to exist by six or seven acts, not amounting to forbidden crimes, separated, some of them, by an interval of one, two, or more years, and extending altogether through a space of more than five years. On this ground, I further plead in excuse or palliation, that the acts charged are too few in number to constitute habitual impurity.

As the acts laid to my charge are few in number, so are they remote in time, retrograding from two and a half to seven and a half years ago. And though my conscience does not upbraid me with impurity in the acts

* Bishop Onderdonk afterwards published the following, respecting this document, in his *Statement of Facts*:

"It has been rumored that in my address to the Court, between conviction and sentence, I admitted the truth of the charges. The readers of that document will, I think, see that this was not the case. It is evident, from the very object of that address, that it ought to have been framed on the *supposition* of the sufficiency of the evidence for the verdict which *had been found*. This is the amount of the alleged admission. There will also be found in the address proof that inquiry into the evidence was only *waived*, not *abandoned*."

alleged, (the most of which I heard for the first time in October last, as alleged to my discredit,) yet have I long lived in a state of repentance for all my sins, known and unknown, and habitually sought forgiveness for them from the mercy of God, for the sake of His Son Jesus Christ. And as no act, for nearly two years and a half, is or can be appealed to, to show the insincerity of my repentance, or profession of repentance, I further plead in excuse or palliation, that the acts charged on me are too remote in time to convict me of present guilt.

If suffering were an atonement for faults, I might plead the anguish of mind to which myself, my family, and, I will add, my Diocese, which is dearer to me than both, have been subjected by interruption of my pastoral labors, and the injuries and indignities to which, from the first step towards a presentment, I have been constantly exposed.

If the consciousness of human fallibility, the fear lest, by possibility, the innocent *may* be punished, should restrain the confidence or mitigate the rigor of judgment, I would beseech my Right Reverend Brethren to remember that there is not, as in most other judicatories, an appeal from their decision. The sentence which you will pronounce, Right Reverend Brethren, will be reconsidered by no other court in the Church, but is at once the first and the last which the existing laws of the Church provide.

As punishments, in all human justice, are graduated to crimes, I respectfully request that the Court will bear in mind these grounds of excuse or palliation, (if they be accepted as such), in order that they may righteously proportion my sentence to the offences of which, by a majority of their number, I am convicted.

Thus much, Right Reverend Fathers and Brethren, I have thought that I might say, consistently with Christian humility, and due respect for the decision of a majority of your Court. To enter into a consideration of the evidence on which this decision is founded, and of the influences which, in my humble, though perhaps too partial judgment, have combined to produce it, would be neither respectful to you, nor consistent with the Canonical privilege which is now awarded to me. On these points, therefore, I am *at present* silent, as in duty bound, and am content to wait with meekness the sentence which you are about to pronounce. That I look forward to this sentence with deep anxiety, I do not affect to disguise. But believe me, Right Reverend Fathers and Brethren, my anxiety is not solely for myself; but also for the Church, and for this Court. As respects me, your decision is final for this world, and your power supreme. But, brethren, solemnly protesting as I have protested, and do now protest, before Almighty God and this Court, my entire innocence of all impurity, unchasteness, or immorality, in the acts laid to my charge, and confiding, as I firmly do, in the justice of Almighty God, and the honest judgment of His Church, I of course believe that an unjust sentence of this Court will neither be ratified in Heaven, nor sustained on earth, after the light of reason and truth shall have dispelled, as it surely will dispel, the mists of prejudice and passion. That the sentence which my Right Reverend Brethren are now to pronounce on the most unworthy of their number may not alienate from our body the confidence of the Church, and plunge her into irretrievable distraction, may God, of His infinite mercy, grant through Jesus Christ.

ACTUAL VOTES OF THE COURT

	FIRST SCRUTINY.
1. THE BISHOP OF ILLINOIS.....(P. Chase.)	Bishop of Illinois: <i>Deposition.</i>
2. THE BISHOP OF CONNECTICUT.....(Brownell.)	Bp. of Connecticut: Let the Respondent be <i>Suspended.</i>
3. THE BISHOP OF NORTH CAROLINA.....(Ives.)	I have declared by my vote that I consider the Rt. Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, Bishop of New-York, <i>not guilty</i> of the charges alleged in the Presentment; but, as I am called upon by the Canon for my sentence, I hereby pronounce that he receive as slight an admonition as the Canon will admit. L. SILLIMAN IVES, <i>Bp. of No. Ca.</i>
4. THE BISHOP OF VERMONT.....(Hopkins.)	Deposition. JOHN H. HOPKINS, <i>Bishop of Vermont.</i>
5. THE BISHOP OF KENTUCKY.....(Smith.)	Let him be suspended. B. B. SMITH, <i>Bp. of the P. E. Ch. in the Dio. of Ky.</i>
6. THE BISHOP OF OHIO.....(McIlvaine.)	Bishop of Ohio: <i>Deposition.</i>
7. THE BISHOP OF NEW-JERSEY.....(Doane.)	I have declared the Respondent not guilty, and so believe him; but, as a majority of the Court have decided otherwise, and sentence must be passed, mine is: Let him receive the lightest admonition contemplated by the Canon. G. W. DOANE, <i>Bishop of New-Jersey.</i>
8. THE BISHOP OF THE NORTH WESTERN MISSIONARY DIOCESE.....(Kemper.)	Admonition. JACKSON KEMPER. 3 Jan., 1845.
9. THE BISHOP OF LOUISIANA.....(Polk.)	The Bp. of Louisiana votes for <i>Deposition.</i>
10. THE BISHOP OF WESTERN NEW-YORK. (De Lancey.)	Admonition. W. H. DE LANCEY.
11. THE BISHOP OF SOUTH CAROLINA..(Gadsden.)	Inasmuch as the Canon seems to make it necessary that some penalty should be awarded, the Bishop of South Carolina is in favor of <i>Admonition.</i>
12. THE BISHOP OF MARYLAND..(Whittingham.)	My sentence is for the lightest degree of <i>Admonition.</i> WILLIAM ROLLINSON WHITTINGHAM, <i>Bishop of Maryland.</i>
13. THE BISHOP OF DELAWARE.....(A. Lee.)	Deposition. ALFRED LEE.
14. THE ASSISTANT BISHOP OF VIRGINIA. (Johns.)	For <i>Deposition.</i> J. JOHNS.
15. THE BISHOP OF MASSACHUSETTS...(Eastburn.)	Deposition. M. EASTBURN.
16. THE BISHOP OF RHODE ISLAND...(Henshaw.)	Let him be <i>deposed.</i> J. P. K. HENSHAW.
17. THE BISHOP OF THE SOUTH WESTERN MISSIONARY DIOCESE.....(Freeman.)	Let him be <i>suspended.</i> GEO. W. FREEMAN, <i>Miss'y Bp. of Arkansas.</i>

UPON THE SENTENCE.

SECOND SCRUTINY.	THIRD SCRUTINY.
Deposition. Bp. of Illinois.	Bp. of Illinois : Deposition.
Bp. of Connecticut : Suspension.	Bp. of Connecticut : Suspension.
Admonition. L. SILLIMAN IVES, <i>Bp. of No. Ca.</i>	Suspension, to ward off Deposition. L. SILLIMAN IVES, <i>Bp. of No. Ca.</i>
Deposition. JOHN H. HOPKINS, <i>Bishop of Vermont.</i>	Deposition. JOHN H. HOPKINS, <i>Bishop of Vermont.</i>
Under the conviction that the effect of conviction must be forever to destroy the usefulness of the Respondent, I accede to the vote of those who are in favor of Deposition. B. B SMITH, <i>Bp. of the P. E. Ch. in the Dio. of Ky.</i>	Deposition. B. B. SMITH, <i>Bp. of the P. E. Ch. in the Dio. of Ky.</i>
Bp of Ohio : Deposition.	Bp. of Ohio : Deposition.
Admonition. G. W. DOANE.	There being twice a failure to unite in any sentence, I accede to Suspension. G. W. DOANE
Admonition. JACKSON KEMPER.	KEMPER : Suspension.
Bp. of Louisiana : Deposition.	Bp. Louisiana : Deposition.
Slight admonition. W. H. DE LANCEY.	Suspension. W. H. DE LANCEY.
I accede to Suspension. Bp. of the Diocese of South Carolina.	3d Vote : I accede to Suspension. Bp. So. Carolina.
My sentence is for <i>admonition</i> , but perceiving that there is no hope of securing a majority of votes for that, I accede to the sentence of <i>Suspension</i> . WILLIAM ROLLINSON WHITTINGHAM, <i>Bishop of Maryland.</i>	My sentence is for <i>admonition</i> , but in the conviction that a majority will not be given for that sentence, I accede to the sentence of <i>Suspension</i> . WILLIAM ROLLINSON WHITTINGHAM, <i>Bishop of Maryland.</i>
2d Voting : Suspension. ALFRED LEE.	Deposition. ALFRED LEE.
For Deposition. J. JOHNS.	For Deposition. J. JOHNS.
Suspension. M. EASTBURN.	Deposition. MANTON EASTBURN.
Deposition. J. P. K. HENSHAW.	Suspension. J. P. K. HENSHAW.
Let him be suspended. GEO. W. FREEMAN.	Suspension. G. W. F.

ANALYSIS OF THE VOTES.

"After an entire failure, a complete rout of all the efforts of the Puritanical clique, both in the New-York Convention and in the General Convention, and when, by such failure, Bishop Onderdonk's course had finally been virtually approved, one last desperate effort was made, and the offending member cut off, by the very votes of some who had openly arraigned and denounced his conduct in the Ordination of Mr. Carey."—*Voice of Truth*, No. V., p. 7.

<i>Bishops.</i>	<i>Opposed to the Bishop</i>	<i>First Scrutiny.</i>	<i>Second Scrutiny.</i>	<i>Third Scrutiny.</i>
1. ILLINOIS	Personally and doctrinally.	Deposition.	Deposition.	Deposition.
2. CONNECTICUT.....	Doctrinally.	Suspension.	Suspension.	Suspension.
3. NORTH CAROLINA.....		Admonition.	Admonition.	Suspension.
4. VERMONT.....	Personally and doctrinally.	Deposition.	Deposition.	Deposition.
5. KENTUCKY.....	Doctrinally.	Suspension.	Deposition.	Deposition.
6. OHIO.....	Personally and doctrinally.	Deposition.	Deposition.	Deposition.
7. NEW-JERSEY.....		Admonition.	Admonition.	Suspension.
8. NORTHWEST.....		Admonition.	Admonition.	Suspension.
9. LOUISIANA.....	Doctrinally.	Deposition.	Deposition.	Deposition.
10. W. NEW-YORK.....		Admonition.	Admonition.	Suspension.
11. SOUTH CAROLINA.....		Admonition.	Suspension.	Suspension.
12. MARYLAND.....		Admonition.	Suspension.	Suspension.
13. DELAWARE.....	Doctrinally.	Deposition.	Suspension.	Deposition.
14. ASSISTANT VIRGINIA.....	Doctrinally.	Deposition.	Deposition.	Deposition.
15. MASSACHUSETTS.....	Doctrinally.	Deposition.	Suspension.	Deposition.
16. RHODE ISLAND.....	Doctrinally.	Deposition.	Deposition.	Suspension.
17. SOUTHWEST.....	Doctrinally.	Suspension.	Suspension.	Suspension.
For Admonition.....		6	4	0
For Suspension.....		3	6	9
For Deposition.....		8	7	8

PRESENTING BISHOPS.

MEADE of Virginia, doctrinally. OTEY, of Tennessee, doctrinally.
ELLIOTT, of Georgia, doctrinally.

ABSENT BISHOPS.

MACOSKRY, of Michigan. COBBS, of Alabama.
CHASE, of New-Hampshire. HAWKES, of Missouri.

The following remarks upon the voters appeared in an editorial in *The Churchman's Newspaper*, published in London, February 18th, 1845:

"At least six of the judges should not, from what we understand, have sat upon that bench to condemn their brother. Three* of them, if they had followed the usage of civil or military courts, would have declined to act; and all were fit subjects for challenge, if challenge had been allowed. Those three stood before the Church as his accusers on another matter, each also having his private griefs to sway him. Of the other three, one was absent while nearly all of the testimony for the defence was submitted;† one is the assistant and expected successor of the Bishop who headed the prosecution,‡ and one could enter upon the records of the Court an argument for a lighter punishment, and vote twice for the highest.§"

* Bishops McIlvaine, Philander Chase, and Hopkins.
‡ Bishop Johns, Assistant of Bishop Meade.

† Bishop Brownell.
§ Bishop Smith.

BISHOP DOANE ON THE VOTE FOR ADMONITION.

The undersigned has declared his "opinion" that the Respondent in this case is *not guilty* of "immorality and impurity," as charged in the Presentment. He holds to that conviction. A majority of the Court, however, have declared that, in their "opinion," he is "guilty;" and by the Canon, "the Court," of which the undersigned is one, must now "pass sentence, and award the penalty of admonition, suspension, or deposition." The undersigned, and those who agreed with him in "opinion," must withhold themselves from the further action of "the Court," and so expose the Respondent, who, in their "opinion," is *not guilty*, to the highest sentence which the Canon knows; or else they must unite in consenting to a lower sentence on one, who, in their opinion, is deserving of none. Between these two, the undersigned does not permit himself to hesitate. "Deposition," by the present Canonical provisions of this Church, is irrevocable. Should such be the decision of a majority of this Court, not only the Respondent, but themselves would be cut off from any future beneficial action. The undersigned is bound in conscience, so far as in him lies, to avert a result so unjust and so unhappy. Therefore, although he has voted that the Respondent is "not guilty," and still believes him so, his "sentence" is, *that he receive the lightest "admonition" permitted by the Canon.*

G. W. DOANE,
Bishop of New-Jersey.

ON THE VOTE FOR SUSPENSION.

The Court having failed, in two several scrutinies, to "pass sentence" on the Respondent, by a majority of their votes, the undersigned now consents to "suspension," to avoid "deposition."

G. W. DOANE,
Bishop of New-Jersey.

DR. SEABURY ON THE SENTENCE.

The subjoined extracts are from a sermon by the Rev. Samuel Seabury, D. D., in reference to the trial of the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk, D. D., Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, preached in the Church of the Annunciation, on Sunday, January 5th, 1845.

"I was dumb with silence: I held my peace, even from good; and my sorrow was stirred."
Ps. xxxix. 2.

About two months have passed since, under one of those instructive figures which the Sacred History furnishes, I alluded to the fortunes of the Bishop of this Diocese, as one who, as I verily believed, was assailed by enemies, for no better reason than because an excellent spirit was in him. The presentment which was then brought against him, appeared to me to be the last of a series of party measures, and I had little doubt that, like previous measures of the same sort, it would fail, and recoil on the heads of the agents. I held my Bishop to be innocent of the charges brought against him; and I hoped that the good providence of God would make his innocence manifest to the world. Indeed, I then doubted whether the Court which was convened, would even enter upon the investigation which is now concluded. For I said to myself, and wiser and better men than I said the same, Here is a charge brought against my Bishop of im-

morality; a charge that he is now AN IMMORAL MAN, unworthy of his office; and this charge is attempted to be supported by a few specified acts—I believe six in number—the latest of which is alleged to have occurred two years and a half, and the first nearly eight years ago. Not one of these acts was a crime such as is properly cognizable in human courts; all were at the worst such offences against the decencies and manners of life as society is sufficiently shielded against by private expressions of displeasure, and the established rules of social intercourse. On the supposition that they flowed from a wrong motive, and so were sinful in the eye of God, they were, as it seemed to me, too few in number to prove a habit of sin, and too remote in time to sustain the charge of present immorality. And I therefore argued that the Court, looking only at the face of the presentment, and without going at all into the investigation of the facts, might equitably dismiss the matter on the ground that the facts alleged, even if true, failed to support the charge. Or, if the investigation were made, and the *specifications* proved, I still did not believe that the *charge* would be held to be sustained. Or, at the worst, supposing the facts to be proved, and the charge sustained, I confess I did think that the immorality now believed to attach to the accused in consequence of acts so few in number, and so remote in time, would be regarded as meriting only the slightest form of punishment which the Canons provide. An admonition, or a short suspension, such as would allow time for a retreat from the absorbing cares and distractions of the Episcopal office, in order to a severe examination of conscience, and a new and holier preparation for the faithful discharge of its duties, seemed to me to be the extremest sentence which, in the worst view of the case, the Court would pronounce. Aware how prone the minds of men are, in times of excitement, to be warped by the prejudices and heat of party animosities, and knowing that between a large portion of the Court and the accused there was neither personal nor party sympathy, but strong points of personal and theological repulsion; and aware also of the powerful pressure from without of a public opinion formed on principles adverse to the Church, and fearing that other members of the Court were not so far above human infirmity as to be independent of such influences, the thought of deposition did occasionally cross my mind. But I could not believe that such a sentence would be seriously contemplated. For it seemed to me to be an obvious dictate of justice, that there should be some proportion between punishment and crime; and a dictate of wisdom also, for surely it must greatly discourage, if not utterly blast, the virtue of penitent and ingenuous confession, and lead to studied dissimulation and hypocrisy, if offences comparatively (and only comparatively, for all sin is hateful in the eye of God) light, should be visited with the extremest rigors which the Canons provide. And besides, I supposed that degradation—a sentence which should never be contemplated save in those cases of aggravated crime which forbid all reasonable hope of clear and lasting repentance and restoration to usefulness, which would blast the prospects of the accused for life, and overwhelm himself and his family with dismay, anguish, and desolation—would be avoided by those members of the Court who had the least sympathy with the accused, if not from considerations of justice and wisdom, at least from considerations of prudence, since such a sentence could be reasonably viewed in no other light than as the evidence of a proscriptive and vindictive temper. Such, I say, were the honest expectations with which I awaited the approach and termination of this trial. As the trial went forward, all that I had heard about the testimony of the witnesses went to excite my hopes for the best; all that I heard about the temper of the Court went to excite my fears for the worst. But throughout the whole I have abstained from public comment.

"I held my tongue, and spake nothing; I kept silence, even from good words," though "my sorrow was stirred."

But the trial is now ended; and the result is that our Bishop is adjudged Guilty by a majority of the Court; and that while eight of its members voted, on one ballot, for degradation, a majority concurred, on a third balloting, in the sentence of suspension—unlimited, indefinite suspension—not only from his Episcopal office, but also from the exercise of his Ministry. I shall read the sentence, as I find it already, and for the first time, in a *newspaper*.

OFFICIAL SENTENCE IN THE CASE OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

The Court of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, convened under the authority of Canon III. of 1844 of the General Convention of said Church, for the trial of the presentment of the Right Reverend Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk, Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, by the Right Reverend William Meade, Bishop of the Diocese of Virginia, the Right Reverend James Hervey Otey, Bishop of the Diocese of Tennessee, and the Right Reverend Stephen Elliott, Junior, Bishop of the Diocese of Georgia, upon certain charges and specifications in said presentment set forth; having fully heard the allegations and testimony of the parties, and deliberately considered the same, and a majority of the said Court having declared, that in their opinion the accused is guilty of certain of the charges and specifications contained in the presentment; which declaration of a majority of the Court has been reduced to writing, and signed by those who assented thereto, and has been pronounced in the presence of the parties; and the Court having proceeded, after hearing the accused, to pass sentence upon the accused, in conformity with the provisions of said Canon; and having determined that the penalty to be affixed and pronounced in said case shall be that of *Suspension*,—

It is hereby *ordered and declared* that the sentence of this Court upon the respondent is *suspension* from the office of a Bishop in the Church of God, and from all the functions of the Sacred Ministry; and this Court do hereby solemnly *pronounce and declare* that the Right Reverend Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk is suspended from all exercise of his Episcopal and ministerial functions; and do order that the notice of this sentence, required by said Canon, be communicated by the Presiding Bishop, under his hand and seal, to the ecclesiastical authority of every Diocese of this Church.

[SEAL.]

Given under my hand and seal this third day of January, A. D. 1845.

PHILANDER CHASE,
Senior Bishop, and President of the Court.

Brethren, I bow to the decision of the Court! With my confidence in the purity of the man unshaken, I bow to the decision which suspends the Bishop. With a firm belief that the verdict of this Court, which adjudges the Bishop to be guilty, will be reversed at the tribunal of God, and by the calm and deliberate judgment of the Church, I submit to a result brought about in conformity with her Canonical provisions. I offer no resistance, I make no complaints, I harbor no revenge against the instruments who have accomplished this result. Saving to myself my own right of opinion—my own right to repose confidence in what man soever I please—my own right, in all proper ways, to labor in vindication and support of one who (God be praised for this signal mercy) is my Bishop still, and having an eye only to the outward Court, I bow to this decision; and I ask you to look it fully and fairly in the face; and reflect on your responsibility to God, how you ought to feel, and what you ought to do.

It is told of Socrates. I believe, that while he was in prison, under sentence of death by a frenzied multitude, his friends provided for him a way of escape, and that he refused to avail himself of it, but preferred to remain and drink the hemlock in obedience to the law. It is said of Fenelon that he read from the pulpit, and declared his concurrence in, the sentence of the Pope who condemned his book. And we all know the story of the martyr Laud, who was condemned, with the formalities of justice, by a

bigoted Puritanical faction, and cheerfully bared his neck to the axe of the executioner. Socrates was not guilty of the crime imputed to him, but he submitted to his sentence as if he were guilty. Fenelon did not believe his book to be erroneous, but he treated it as if it were erroneous. Laud did not believe his sentence to be just, but he prayed for his judges, blessed his executioner, and composed his mind, and laid his head on the block as cheerfully as if his sentence were just; and in fact far more cheerfully than he could have done if the sentence had been just. So in relation to our Bishop. I believe that he is not guilty, but I am willing to conform to the sentence, as if he were guilty. I submit to the deprivation of Episcopal services as long as the deprivation lasts.

* * * * *

It is a confessed rule that the authority of an Ecclesiastical Council, considered as influencing private judgment, should be estimated by the character of its individual members, the influences under which they assemble and pursue their deliberations, the *animus* apparent in their proceedings, and by the reception accorded to their decision by the collective Church, after its grounds shall have been fully scrutinized. I am not inwardly bound, therefore, by the decision of this Court; I am not bound by any Church principle to conform my opinion to its judgment, but am free to think and to say, as I do think and say, that it deserves not the weight of a feather.

THE "BANNER OF THE CROSS" ASSERTS THE ENTIRE INNOCENCE OF THE BISHOP.

We commend to the notice of the present editor of the *Banner of the Cross* the following paragraph, which appeared editorially in that paper in 1845. If he had been so fortunate as to have seen this before penning a recent article, ungenerously reflecting upon the Bishop, it might have saved his readers the surprise and mortification produced by the perusal of sentiments so foreign to the views of his predecessors—the *Banner* having heretofore been a staunch defender of the persecuted prelate:

"Since the final adjournment of the Court, we have had particular and authentic information as to its proceedings; and the result is our present discharge of what we feel to be a high and solemn duty before God and the world, in calmly and deliberately proclaiming our thorough conviction of the ENTIRE INNOCENCE of Bishop Onderdonk. We say this with a full knowledge of all that is implied in it—with a just sense of the responsibility we thus incur—and with all due respect and reverence for the majority of the Ecclesiastical Court. But we cannot hesitate a moment as to what the cause of truth and righteousness requires of us; and, whatever may be the consequences, sooner would we lay down our life than listen to that *prudent* policy which advises us to suspend our opinion. No; we have 'suspended' the *expression* of that opinion long enough; satisfied we were, from the beginning, that such frivolous and unjust charges as were made the basis of the 'presentment' would never have been dreamed of, had it not been for the Ecclesiastical events of the last two years; and were we still to 'hold our peace' when we see the Bishop the *temporary* victim of those who saw fit to maintain a profound silence, year after year, until, as their organ and leader (Col. Webb, of the *New York Courier and En-*

quirer) had the strange candor to avow it, they had 'arrived at the conclusion that *the moment was auspicious*'—'the very stones would immediately cry out against us.' "

THE "BUFFALO COMMERCIAL ADVERTISER" ON THE TRIAL.

IN arriving at a conclusion to my strictures on the evidence of the various charges against the Right Reverend Bishop Onderdonk, of New-York, I am conscious of having passed silently over much which would further tend to cast the whole affair into ridicule; but the results are of too serious a nature to depart for a moment from the great object in hand—that of proving the Bishop innocent, and his opponents to be the tools and front of a deep-laid conspiracy, to succeed in which they have sacrificed modesty, virtue, honor, and truth.

There is ample evidence to show, that all the charges, though occurring in different places and different periods, are closely allied, not through the women, but through their husbands and coadjutors. There is evidence of these charges being nursed, from time to time, until the "propitious" day should arrive when they could pounce on their victim, as the tiger on his prey. What virtue, what station, what intellect, could resist such systematic schemes of destruction? And were three avowed enemies, of the Bench of Bishops, all men of ability, not sufficient to taint the minds of all the other Bishops, united together in Low Church principles? It certainly proved sufficient. Mr. Graham in his defence as Bishop's counsel, while advancing strong and substantial reasons for his client's acquittal, shows, in every line of his argument, that he knew how vain were all his truths and efforts, for he evidently felt that he was speaking in favor of a prejudiced man, and to a Court whose prejudices were so deeply implanted in them as not to be shaken by any appeal of either truth or mercy.

We cannot be too grateful to those Bishops who decided that Bishop Onderdonk was innocent, for a difference of opinion in Court encourages public discussion on the merits of the charges; and we should thank the convicting Bishops for publishing the evidence, as, by doing so, they unwittingly gave us the tools with which to expose either the weakness of their heads or the lurking sin of their hearts; and I cannot help believing that the greatest slip in their proceedings was this publication. That a majority of unthinking people would, on the first perusal of these nauseous pages, decide the Bishop to be a very bad man, is true; they foresaw that; but, after a time, different heads exchange sentiments on the subject, until, by and by, the whole public not wickedly prejudiced, will build around the venerable Prelate a bulwark of public favor, which will awe his enemies into doing him the only justice now in their power.

Sad as the consequences of this terrible decision is, it would be more awful still, should the Bishop desert the cause of the rights of man, so far as to resign his office. May God give him courage to maintain his ground, and may he never forget that his resignation would be the first knell of departing freedom from the inhabitants of the most promising Republic of the world; and, whatever his injured feelings may be, let him, by adhering to his Diocese as their Bishop, pay beforehand that public, who will, ere long, do him most ample justice!

To see a great man, who has spent his whole life for others, crushed unjustly; to think of the blushing shame and misery of his faithful wife and daughters, if he has any; to think of the merciless doom to which he has been cruelly assigned, are enough to rouse, and it will rouse, the contempt and execration of the whole educated world against his sentence.

1845.

AMICUS VERITATIS.

THE BISHOP'S REITERATION OF HIS ENTIRE INNOCENCE.

THERE appears to have been, in the whole of the preparation for subjecting me to the late trial, a singular, and certainly a most unchristian effort, to evade *the possibility of failing* in that design, by not allowing the chance which our Divine Lord provides for his followers, of avoiding *public discipline* by the beneficent influence of *private remonstrance*. And surely not less singular and unchristian is the disposition thus manifested, to resist the Saviour's gracious purpose, in this blessed provision, of warding off scandal to His Church. Three of the prominent actors in this matter, the Rev. Messrs. Paul Trapier, John B. Gallagher, and Clement M. Butler, had been connected with me by the sacred tie of Christian instructor and Christian pupils. Not one of them ever uttered to me a word indicative of wounded feeling, of knowledge of charges against me, or of solicitude for what might be the consequence of evil report on one who had ever treated them as a father and a friend. The first that that father and friend knew that any of them had aught against him, was his finding them, as his formal accusers, arrayed for bringing down upon him the strong arm of the Discipline of the Church. How far their conduct admits, not of the *excuse* (for there can be none), but of the *explanation*, that there were malignant promptings behind them, not yet *fully* brought to light, is what, in the providence of a just and righteous God, may hereafter more clearly appear. Had they adopted the course which was bounden upon them as Christian men and Christian ministers, it is morally certain that they had not been guilty of inflicting such wounds on the Church, and bringing such wicked scandal on its holy cause. Having been the means of producing excitement against me in a distant part of the country, heightened and rendered efficient by co-operation with enmity to my religious principles, they found willing coadjutors in the work of stirring up strife within my own Diocese. An agent from another distant State was employed, who, loudly proclaiming his work, in domestic circles, in places of public resort, among the masses congregated in travelling vehicles, any where and every where affording a hearing ear, spread the matter far and wide, and set ten thousand tongues at work to spread it further. The press took it up, even in the lowest and most malignant form and spirit in which that mighty engine can do its work. Thus was there *made* a public rumor to which, three weeks before, this Diocese was an utter stranger, and which was assumed as ground for instituting the trial, and pushing it to the conviction and punishment said to be demanded by the thus disturbed community. I was the victim whose sacrifice was to meet the demand.

My original plea of *not guilty* is here solemnly renewed. It respects both *the purpose of my heart and the misconduct alleged*. But let me not be suspected of putting forth any proud claim to exemption from frailty and sinfulness. While truth would be sacrificed did I profess consciousness of having justly incurred the verdict which has been awarded me, God knows that I presume not to absolve of guilt before Him, in the perpetual sinfulness of my heart, and in daily leaving undone what I ought to do, and doing what I ought not to do. And God forbid that I should not be humbled under a sense of the too successful betrayments, in each of these classes of omission and commission, into which I am often thrown. They are perpetual calls for contrition, humility, and repentance. May I have grace not to suffer them—God forgive me if I am wrong in the humble hope that *I do not* suffer them—to pass unheeded!

It has pleased my Maker to give me—friends and enemies unite to tell me so—a heart inclined warmly to reciprocate friendly affection, to yield to its reality or appearance in others, and to be unsuspecting of deceit in

professed friends. I have carried this too far, and trusted too fully that my own unconsciousness of any other than right emotion, entered also into the apparent sympathy with which I was met. As the result, exaggerations, distortions, mis-statements, have turned to ill what was so neither in intent nor in deed. Evil, totally undesigned and unthought of by me, and not justly attributable to me, has, by this means, been done to a cause dearer to me than life. I humbly trust that I have profited by the bitter experience, and earnestly pray—and ask the faithful, fervent prayers of the beloved clergy and people of my Diocese in my behalf—that this profiting may appear in all that, in my character and conduct, may pertain to the glory of God, the cause of His Gospel, and the purity and prosperity of His Church.

I know not how extensively efforts may still be in progress, and yet be multiplied, against me. There are propensities in the human heart which foster even a *love* for rendering the unhappy still more miserable, for trampling the fallen still more deeply in the dust, for closing the door to all influence of the reacting spirit of Christian justice and mercy, and for pushing malevolent design to the utmost gratification. *In the Lord put I my trust.* To Him, *as the Searcher of hearts*, I commit my cause.

I thank God that my connection with the Diocese which I love so much, whose love to me has contributed so largely to my happiness, and in whose behalf I have so gladly and heartily, but, alas, so imperfectly labored, is not severed. I feel that this imposes upon me a most serious responsibility. I ask the union with my own, of the prayers of the Diocese, that I may be rightly guided; may be ready and willing to sacrifice to duty all personal considerations; may not forget to cherish, as they should be cherished, reverence and submission to authority; may have grace to be free from unchristian resentment for efforts that have been made, that may now be making, or that may yet be made, to destroy my character and influence; and may be led, in all that may devolve upon me, to such decision and such action, as will be approved by THE LORD THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGE.

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK.

NEW-YORK, *January*, 1845.

THE SMOTHERED CANON.

THE following article, from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Seabury, appeared in *The Churchman* of March 1, 1845:

The unlawfulness of a trial under a Canon enacted subsequently to the time when the offences charged against the person tried are alleged to have been committed, seems to us to be conclusively made out by a correspondent, on the principles of common morality and common sense as well as of law. There is another question on which men may form an intelligent opinion with no other lights than those of common sense, knowledge of human nature, and love of moral equity; and that is whether all the legislation and attempted legislation on the trial of a Bishop were not liable to be biassed by the simultaneous agitation, among the members of Convention, of the question of the presentment of so marked a man as the Bishop of New-York. This is one of those subjects on which it is difficult to write without either exposing one's self to the charge of insinuating what one is afraid to avow, or holding back opinions which it is due to truth and justice to express. In the way of explanation, therefore, we

deem it proper to premise, that while we do not believe that the theological opponents of Bishop Onderdonk were capable of entering into a contract, verbal or written, to effect his destruction by insidious legislation, we do believe that they were not so far above the passions and infirmities of human nature, as to shut out from their minds all influence of his contemplated presentment. If we are unfair in this belief, we are unfair to human nature, and not to the opponents of Bishop Onderdonk, personally considered. We hold it to be extremely improbable, on the acknowledged principles of human nature, that the prospect of Bishop Onderdonk's presentment should not have biassed the legislative proceedings of all those who entertained the prospect pending those proceedings. Our remark is general and applicable to the friends as well as the opponents of the Bishop; neither of whom, we are persuaded, could have taken part in the passage of a Canon on the Trial of a Bishop, or any kindred subject, without being influenced by considerations bearing on Bishop Onderdonk's particular case, if his trial were in prospect. Certainly there are several features in the Canon of the last Convention which, if his friends, and especially the New-York delegation, had suffered to pass in silence while they expected him to be tried under it, they would have been considered, right or wrong, to have shown a culpable remissness. But *they* had no expectation of such an event as the impeachment of Bishop Onderdonk. This we know to be true of the New-York delegation, and we have no reason to doubt that it is equally true of a large majority of those Clerical and Lay Deputies with whom they might be expected to act in concert; and it is on the ground of their not having any such prospect before them that we account for their having made no attempt to secure a two-thirds vote (instead of a majority) for a verdict, a clause of limitation, a right of challenge, and other matters which might have been equitably inserted in the Canon, or at least proposed. On the other hand, it appears from Bishop Onderdonk's "Statement," from Bishop Meade's Statement, and from the pamphlets of the Rev. Messrs. Trapier and Richmond, that the opponents of Bishop Onderdonk were, during the time that the Convention was in session, engaged in measures, to which indeed the Bishop and his friends attached at the time very little importance, but which have since turned out to be preliminary to his impeachment, trial, and indefinite suspension. Is it then, at all inconsistent with charity to believe that the opponents of the Bishop during the Convention, entertained the expectation of his presentment? Or that entertaining it they acted under its influence? Or that its influence might have predisposed them to devise or favor those very features of the Canon which a counter-influence would most unquestionably have led his friends strenuously to oppose? We see nothing in the opinion inconsistent with Christian principles and sound reason; nothing which is not perfectly natural.

In the remarks which we are about to offer, we mean to insinuate nothing which we are unwilling to express; but we mean to bring together facts in the order in which they really occurred, and to make ourselves, and to suggest to our readers, such inferences from the combination as we think to be warranted by the known principles of human conduct.

The General Convention met on the second of October. From Bishop Onderdonk's statement, confirmed by Bishop Meade, it appears that "some six or seven days after the opening of the Convention," Bishop Meade requested Bishop Onderdonk to leave the room in which the Bishops assembled in order, as it afterwards appeared, that the former might bring before his brethren sundry matters to the disparagement of the former. On the fourteenth day of October, Bishop Chase introduced to the atten-

tion of the House of Bishops a paper relating to the character and conduct of the Bishop of New-York, and asked him if he wished to retire. Bishop Onderdonk remained, and the paper, after an earnest discussion, was not received, but returned unopened to the persons who presented it. On the twelfth of October, that is between the attempt of Bishop Meade and the attempt of Bishop Chase to make the character of Bishop Onderdonk, in his absence, a topic of discussion with their brethren, Bishop McIlvaine, from the Committee on Canons, (consisting of Bishops McIlvaine, Gadsden, and Elliott), reported the following Canon:

Of the Effect of Suspension from the Ministry upon Jurisdiction.

SECTION 1. Any Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, who shall incur the penalty of indefinite Suspension from the exercise of the Ministry by the proper authority, shall be thereby held incapable of Jurisdiction, whether Parochial or Diocesan, during the continuance of such suspension, and shall be void of any Jurisdiction vested in him at the time of such suspension, by the sentence duly awarded and pronounced.

SECTION 2. In case of the limited suspension of any Bishop, the Standing Committee of the Diocese of such suspended Bishop may apply to any Bishop or Bishops of this Church to perform Episcopal duties within such Diocese; which duties shall be reported in writing to the Convention of said Diocese, at its annual meeting, by the Bishop or Bishops performing the same.

SECTION 3. In case of the limited Suspension of any Presbyter of this Church having charge of a Parish, the Wardens and Vestry of the Parish of such suspended Presbyter may apply to any Presbyter or Presbyters of this Church to perform the Parochial duties within such Parish, which duties shall be reported in writing to the Bishop of the Diocese in which such Parish is located, at its annual meeting, by the Presbyter or Presbyters performing the same.

On motion of Bishop Ives, seconded by Bishop Doane, this Canon passed the House of Bishops. On the same day it was sent to the House of Deputies. On the 17th, Dr. Upfold, Chairman of the Committee on Canons reported, and offered a resolution to the effect that the House concur in the enactment of the Canon, striking out its first section.

The House having considered the same—on motion,
Resolved, That this House do concur with the House of Bishops in the enactment of the Canon entitled, “Of the Effect of Suspension from the Ministry upon Jurisdiction,” with the following amendments:

1. Strike out the first and third sections thereof.
2. Strike out the word “limited” in the first line of the second section.

On motion, *Ordered*, That the said Canon thus amended be sent to the House of Bishops.

The concurrence of the House of Deputies in the Canon as thus amended, was reported on the same day to the House of Bishops.

Whereupon, on motion of Bishop Onderdonk, of New-York, seconded by Bishop Brownell,

Resolved, That this House non-concur with the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, in their amendments to the Canon entitled, “Of the Effect of Suspension from the Ministry upon Jurisdiction.”

Resolved, That notice of this non-concurrence be sent to the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, and that this House propose to said House, a conference on the subject of the above-mentioned Canon, and that the Committee of this House on the Canons be appointed on said conference.

The conference was held, and on the 18th, Bishop McIlvaine made the following report:

The Committee on Canons appointed to act as a Committee of Conference with a Committee of the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies on certain amendments made by said House, in the Canon sent down from this House entitled, “Of the Effect of Suspension from the Ministry upon Jurisdiction,” report that they have conferred as directed, and

see no prospect that this House will be able so to modify the Canon under consideration, as to free it from the objections made by the other House, without destroying its essential character.

Your Committee therefore move that they be discharged from the further consideration of this subject.

CHAS. P. McILVAINE, *Chairman*.

Whereupon, on motion of Bishop McIlvaine, seconded by Bishop Gadsden, the above motion was agreed to.

It appears then that Bishop McIlvaine reported a Canon, the effect of which would have been to make a Bishop under sentence of indefinite suspension incapable of jurisdiction; that the objections made by the House of Deputies were such as, if concurred in, would defeat this operation of the Canon; that an attempt was made in a conference to remove these objections; and that after the conference, Bishop McIlvaine reported that it was found impracticable so to modify the Canon as to free it from the objections brought against it, "without destroying its essential character."

But for the objections made to this Canon in the House of Deputies, Bishop Onderdonk would at this moment be incapable of jurisdiction, and stand in no other Canonical relation to the Diocese of New-York than to the Diocese of Ohio. Surely it is remarkable that Bishop Onderdonk should himself have moved the House of Bishops to non-concur in those very objections but for which he would not now be the Bishop of New-York. Surely it is incredible that if he had had an upbraiding conscience, or the least ground for suspicion or fear of the result which a few short weeks afterwards developed, he would not have concurred in and maintained those objections of the Lower House which have saved him from total destruction. It is not in human nature that it should be otherwise. But Bishop Elliott who was with Bishop McIlvaine on the Committee of Canons and Conference, and Bishop Meade, who with Bishop Chase attempted in an informal way to bring Bishop Onderdonk's alleged delinquencies before his brethren, were his presenting Bishops; and for the same reason that we believe that Bishops Onderdonk, Ives, and Doane, if they had at all expected the trial and the indefinite suspension which followed it, would have been led by such expectation to oppose the defeated Canon, we also believe that Bishops McIlvaine and Elliott, if they at all expected the trial and the indefinite suspension which followed it, were led by such expectation first to urge the adoption of the Canon and afterwards to abandon it. Thinking it probable that an indefinite suspension might soon take place, they passed a Canon which made such suspension vacate jurisdiction; and finding that this end of the Canon could not be gained, they abandoned it altogether.

There are some other *notanda* in this smothered Canon.

1. Referring to "indefinite suspension," the first clause provides that the person suspended shall be held incapable of jurisdiction, "*during the continuance of such suspension.*" Now if the framers of the Canon meant by *indefinite* suspension the same as *perpetual* suspension, this clause would not have been inserted; it would either have been omitted, or so expressed as to imply that the suspended person should be incapable of jurisdiction during the remainder of his natural life. Hence we argue that this indefinite suspension was intended to be a suspension unlimited by a *prescribed* time or condition, and to continue *during the will* of some body or some person or persons supposed to have the power to remove it. In this view we are confirmed by a remark attributed to one of the Bishops in reference to the suspension (also indefinite,) of Bishop H. U. Onderdonk, intimating that the sentence might be removed by the House of Bishops at the next General Convention. Now to make a sentence of

suspension determinable neither by a limit of time nor the performance of a fixed condition evidencing contrition and amendment, but by the mere will, possibly the caprice of a higher power, is an insidious license of tyranny. The man or men who may keep another suspended *at will*, have him completely in their power; and though the sentence be awarded by the rules of law and liberty, yet if it may be instantly reversed or oppressively continued by the *sic volo sic jubeo* of an irresponsible power, the ends of law and liberty are defeated. Our opinion is that the Low Church Bishops anticipating for themselves a majority in the House of Bishops, devised this Canon as the means of exercising arbitrary power; and though we regret that the design should have escaped the observation of their colleagues, we are none the less thankful that it was frustrated in the House of Deputies.

2. Why did the House of Deputies require the word *limited* to be expunged from the second section? We see no meaning in the omission, except it be that suspension is in its nature limited, and therefore the word is superfluous. And in this view we are confirmed by several members of the late General Convention, that the word was in fact objected to on this very ground.

3. It is remarkable that if this Canon had passed in the form in which it was approved by the House of Deputies, it would have invested the Standing Committee of this Diocese, by express letter, with the very authority which they have now felt themselves constrained to assume, and to fortify by ingenious though questionable construction. Without the remotest apprehension that New-York would soon have a suspended Bishop, and with no other than a general view, the House of Deputies voted for the Canon in a form in which it would now benefit our Diocese and meet the wishes of our Standing Committee. Bishop McIlvaine, however, from the Committee on Canons, reported, that *in this form* the Canon was useless. Now whether Bishops McIlvaine and Elliott did or did not entertain the opinion that our Diocese might probably soon be in the position in which it now is, it is certainly remarkable that by stifling the Canon in this form they have enabled the most violent opponents of Bishop Onderdonk to take precisely the ground which in fact they have taken in order to drive the Bishop into a resignation; the ground, namely, that the Diocese must be deprived of all Episcopal services as long as Dr. Onderdonk continues to be Bishop. The first aim of the Canon was to make indefinite suspension void jurisdiction; and being foiled in this, Bishops McIlvaine and Elliott report against the Canon in a form which, if it had been adopted, would have taken from their friends in this Diocese the strongest argument which they now use to compass the same end, viz.: to void the jurisdiction of our suspended Bishop. Bishop McIlvaine might well report that concurrence with the House of Deputies would rob the Canon of "its essential character."

We have the charity to believe that it required the excitement (in door and out door) of the late trial to work up a portion of the Court to the point of degradation; and that when the presentment was getting up, and before the public mind was pre-occupied with rumors, nothing worse was contemplated than the less odious, though equally effectual, *terminus* of an indefinite suspension which should vacate jurisdiction. Of course we do not know that even this view was held, but we will state another fact—*valeat quantum*, &c.—that a gentleman of great eminence and foresight in another Diocese, wrote, pending the trial and at a time when we had no thought of any thing but an acquittal or at worst an admonition, to a friend in this city, pointing out the invalidity of a sentence of indefinite suspension, it being *his* opinion that the Court would terminate its proceedings with the infliction of this identical sentence.

First Movement

FOR THE

RESTORATION OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

Soon after the unjust sentence of suspension was pronounced upon Bishop Onderdonk, he determined to address, in the first instance, the Bishops, as soon as their House should be organized, on the first day of the Session of the General Convention of 1847. It was his object in this address to them to take the most general ground, avoiding all points or references which might hinder Christian love and peace from qualifying the rigor of justice where this might be supposed to present counter-claims: and to request action on any ground of law, justice, or mercy, which to his brethren respectively might be deemed the proper one, and in any capacity which they might choose, either as the body of American Bishops competent to act in their own right, or as the House of the Convention proposing joint action to the House of Deputies. Accordingly, on Wednesday, October 6th, the Bishop addressed to his Right Rev. brethren the following communication:

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S LETTER TO THE BISHOPS.

To the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, their suffering brother, the Bishop of New-York, respectfully and earnestly tenders this his request, that they will, by such act as may seem to them right and proper, open the way for his relief from the operation of the sentence of suspension from the Ministry, passed upon him by a portion of their body, forming an Ecclesiastical Court in the city of New-York, in January, 1845.

I make this request, brethren, with an ardent desire again to serve our Master in the functions of our holy office. Severely as I have been afflicted, I humbly hope that, by the overruling providence and grace of God, the period—now nearly three years—of my present heavy trial, has not been, and will not be, without a blessing. In a state of almost entire seclusion from the world, I have earnestly endeavored, in reliance on the Holy Ghost, and with constant prayer for His influences, to keep a per-

petual guard over my heart, to detect its evil tendencies, to discover, for greater future watchfulness, wherein these have led me astray, and to cultivate the spirit of humble penitence, meek submission, and evangelical faith, devotion, and charity. I trust I am not presumptuous in hoping that hence, as well as from the sacred duties and meditations to which I have applied myself, God will graciously allow fruit to grow, both in my personal devotion to a godly life, and in earnest and faithful pastoral labor, should I, in His merciful Providence, again be permitted to minister among His people.

Praying that the Lord will so incline your hearts, and direct your counsels, in a matter fraught to me with such deep and painful solicitude, and such momentous interest, as will most accord with His glory and your duty, I am, Brethren,

Yours, in the bonds of Christian respect and love,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK.

NEW-YORK, October 6, 1847.

It was a part of Bishop Onderdonk's plan to wait, after having sent the above, for the remainder of the week, and if then uninformed as to its favorable effect, to send to the *General Convention* a Memorial praying for its interposition in his behalf, on the ground of the illegality and invalidity of the sentence. He therefore, on Monday, October 11th, sent the following to each House of the Convention :

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S FIRST MEMORIAL.*

To the Bishops, the Clergy, and the Laity of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, in General Convention assembled, the Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, respectfully presents this Memorial :

It is known to your venerable body that your memorialist was, on the third day of January, in the year 1845, declared by a Court of Bishops, organized under a Canon of the General Convention, and holding its sessions in the city of New-York, to be suspended from all Episcopal and ministerial functions ; as appears by the printed record of the proceedings of said Court, to which (the same having been published and extensively circulated) your memorialist respectfully refers your venerable body for the details of his trial by the said Court.

Firmly persuaded that the sentence then passed on him was not justified by the laws of the Church, and that the privations and sufferings to which he has been and is thereby subjected, are at variance with principles which lie at the foundation of the rights and liberties of American citizens, and with those which, by the Protestant Reformation, effected the deliverance of both clergy and laity from the tyranny of unjust and anomalous judicial proceedings ; your memorialist appeals for relief to your venerable body, as representing the wisdom, righteousness, and authority of the Church which has constituted it, as well as for remedy of illegal proceedings, had under the supposed sanction of its laws, as for providing just and wholesome legislation.

* The following note accompanied the Memorial :

"The Bishop of New-York respectfully requests the Right Rev. the Presiding Bishop of the House of Bishops, to lay the enclosed Memorial before that House.

"NEW-YORK, Oct. 12, 1847."

Without adverting to other existing grounds for relief, but specifying one which concerns the future as well as the past, and the Church, and every Bishop and minister of the Church, as much as it does himself, and which has equal substance and validity in every supposable state of facts ; your memorialist objects to the said sentence, which is *suspension without any period or condition of limitation*, as follows :

Our Canons clearly distinguish between suspension and deposition. The former, therefore, cannot be justly so regarded, or inflicted, as to be rendered practically the same with the latter, in points in which, according to the established meaning of words, there is between them an essential difference. Functions, powers, or rights, personal or official, cannot be *destroyed* by the same law which *only suspends* them. When the thirty-ninth Canon of the General Convention of 1832 declares, "No degraded Minister" (or, which the Canon makes the same thing, no deposed Minister) "shall be restored to the Ministry," it inflicts an awful extremity of punishment and suffering on a particularly defined class of persons, which no man, or body or men, has, without express permission of law, a right to inflict on any other class of persons. Suspension cannot deprive a Minister of a claim to restoration, except upon the principle which would subject the kind and degree of judicial punishment, without restraint of law, to the will and discretion of a Court. Hence, your memorialist argues, that if there is no power appointed by law to terminate a sentence of suspension, and if there is no general law regulating the term of suspensions, and if such sentence, passed by any Court, does not contain within itself provision for its termination, either at a prescribed time, or on prescribed conditions, it is passed contrary to law and equity, or at least *in independence of law* : either of which must be considered as rendering it null and void, while its tendency cannot but be to tyranny and oppression.

Your memorialist, therefore, respectfully pleads, that he is now suffering under the shame and reproach, and under the manifold privations and afflictions, of an illegal sentence, passed upon him by a Court instituted under the authority of your venerable body ; and that, in the absence of any canonically appointed Court of Appeals, he has an equitable claim upon the Supreme Council of the American Church, for redress of the grievous injury and wrong thus done unto him.

In respectfully calling the attention of your venerable body to this subject, your memorialist will not pretend to independence of the personal considerations connected with himself individually, with his domestic and social relations, and with the happiness he has experienced in many years of honest and cordial efforts to be faithful and useful in the several grades of the Christian Ministry.

Still deeper, however, he trusts, is the solicitude with which the occasion fills him for the cause of truth and justice, and for the Christian reputation and interests of our portion of the Church of Christ. Other branches of that Church, and the world, will now have an opportunity of judging of our character for deference to law and order, and for equitable regard to the rights and liberties of all sorts and conditions of men in our communion. Nor, in judging of this, will they forget our peculiar responsibility as a protestant branch of the Church, and one established amidst the free institutions, and the just and equal laws of the North American Republic.

Your memorialist confidently trusts that he will be understood to raise no question respecting his Right Reverend Brethren who pronounced sentence upon him, excepting in regard to their *judgments*. These, it is well known, are often erroneous, in entire consistency with general intelligence,

and with purity and uprightness of motive and intent. The questioning of the legality or equity of judicial proceedings and decisions, he regards as the sacred right of every Christian freeman; which, when exercised respectfully and courteously, cannot be justly impeached on the ground of its personal relations and bearings. Its exercise in the present instance, your memorialist regards as an indispensable requirement of a conscientious sense of what is just and right. It is a duty, in the honest discharge of which, in the fear of God, he throws himself upon the Christian principles and feelings of your venerable body.

That in this, and all other matters that may come before you, you may be guided by the Holy Spirit of wisdom, understanding, counsel, and the fear of God, your memorialist devoutly prays.

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK.

NEW-YORK, October 11, 1847.

After a careful perusal of this document (says Rev. Dr. Seabury),* we cannot but think that it is above just exception, and that its temper must commend it to the approbation even of such ingenuous minds as do not acquiesce in the correctness of its arguments. It brings no accusation against the court, the law, or the witnesses, which have been instrumental in putting the Bishop in his present position. It breathes not a word of censure against the Canon under which he was tried, or the Bishops who took part in the trial. It says not a word of the *ex post facto* operation of the Canon, and makes no allusion to the agencies under which the trial is well understood to have been got up. Never, we believe, did man write under circumstances which invited more various and more severe censure, and yet not a word of censure has escaped from his pen. It is a fair, manly, respectful argument, confined to the single point of the illegality of the sentence, and evincing even on this point an earnest solicitude to be understood as questioning neither the intelligence, nor the piety and charity of the court, but only its *judgment* in the particular matter at issue.

On October 12th the Memorial was read before the House of Bishops, and on motion of Bishop A. Potter, seconded by Bishop Hopkins, was laid upon the table for the present. On October 15th, on motion of Bishop A. Potter, seconded by Bishop Brownell, it was resolved that the Letter and Memorial be referred to a Select Committee of five, to consider and report thereon. On the 28th, the day of the adjournment of the Convention, the Committee reported as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BISHOP ONDERDONK'S MEMORIAL.

The Committee to which was referred the Letter and Memorial of the Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk, D. D., beg leave to report, that they have taken those Documents under their most serious and deliberate consideration, and have come to the following conclusions:

The application of the Memorialist to be relieved from the sentence of the Ecclesiastical Court, by which he stands suspended, without limitation, from the office of the Episcopate and the Ministry, cannot be favorably regarded by your Committee for several reasons.

First. Because the Memorialist, once convicted, on unimpeached and ample testimony, of the charge of immorality, can hardly hope to exercise again his high and holy office, to the honor of God and the edifying of the Church, in the face of the same community.

* From *The Churchman*, December 4, 1847.

The office of a Bishop was conferred upon the Memorialist, not for his own sake, but for the benefit of the Church; and, therefore, it is not for his sake, but for the welfare of the Church, that the exercise of it should ever be committed to him again.

Your Committee do not maintain the impossibility of his restoration, nor deny that he may hereafter satisfy the Church of the strength of his claims; but they do not conceive that it would be consistent with the high and solemn responsibility of the Episcopal character, for the Bishops to entertain the application of the Memorialist, until he can lay before them the most ample and satisfactory testimonials.

Secondly. Whilst your Committee do not perceive that the repentance and reformation of the Memorialist would, of themselves, entitle him to be restored to the full exercise of his Episcopal functions and his charge of the Diocese, yet they are bound in candor further to say, that he does not stand in the position of a penitent. So far from this is the fact, that he has chosen, in his Memorial, to be an accuser of the law, of the court, and of the witnesses; and, instead of confessing his faults, and professing repentance for them, he assumes the character of an injured man, and claims the remission of his sentence as a matter of right. Such being the ground on which the Memorialist has chosen to rest his application, it is manifest that the House of Bishops could not grant it without incurring the reproach, either of admitting the justice of his complaint, or of shrinking from the defence of the truth through the force of clamor. If they were capable of deserving either of these imputations, they would show themselves unworthy of the confidence of the Church, and altogether unfit to guard the holy administration of its discipline, which is committed to their care.

But in none of the censures of the Memorialist can your Committee concur. As to the Canon of 1844, under which he was tried and condemned, the main principle, that a Bishop might be presented by any three Bishops, as well as by his own Convention, was introduced nine years before.

The Constitution of the Church was altered in order to admit the change, and the first Canon in which the principle was embodied, was passed in 1841, with the most entire unanimity. The House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in 1844 made no alteration in that principle, but only supplied the details which many conceived to be necessary to its practical operation. And the Canon passed by them was approved in the House of Bishops by the Memorialist himself, and met with no opposition from any quarter.

And on the trial of the Memorialist under that Canon, not one word was said by him or by his able counsel, about its supposed unconstitutionality, nor about its *ex post facto* operation. Neither was there the slightest exception taken, or attempted to be taken, against any of the Bishops that composed the Court. Neither was there any assault upon the character of the witnesses, or any attempt to impeach their reputation for veracity.

Neither, after the verdict of "Guilty" was declared, and the respondent was called upon to assign his reasons why sentence should not be pronounced, did he suggest a word against the Canon, nor against the legality of the whole proceeding; nor did he even ask for a new trial, or review, as he manifestly should and would have done, if he or his counsel had supposed that injustice had been done him.

The sentence which followed was pronounced by nine of the Court, while the other eight voted for his degradation. And of the validity and effect of that sentence, your Committee cannot have a moment's doubt. It stands, and must stand in full force, until it is remitted by the competent authority. But while your Committee sustain the proposition, that the remission of that sentence is a possible event, in contemplation of law, they deem it but justice to the Memorialist, and to the Diocese of New-York, to add, that they consider the probability of its occurrence so slender and remote, as scarcely to afford a reasonable basis for future action.

In conclusion, your Committee respectfully recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Memorialist have leave to withdraw his Letter and Memorial.
All which is respectfully submitted.

T. C. BROWNELL,
JOHN H. HOPKINS,
J. P. K. HENSHAW,
GEO. W. FREEMAN.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS, Oct. 27, 1847.

The undersigned, without taking part in the argument of the Committee, concurs in the resolution presented.

SAM'L A. MCCOSKRY.

The foregoing resolution was adopted by the House, and the Report entered upon the Minutes, and a copy ordered to be sent to Bishop Onderdonk.

This Report, it will be seen, charges Bishop Onderdonk, in words, with being, "in his Memorial, an accuser of the law, of the court, and of the witnesses." Where is the proof of this charge? There is not a syllable of the kind in the Memorial. As to the law, indeed, how can he be an accuser of it, who appeals to it, and asks to have judgment conformable to it? And as to the court and the witnesses, they may have been accused by the public, by the Church, and by their own consciences, but most certainly they have not been accused in the Memorial of Bishop Onderdonk.

The Report then adds, "In none of the censures of the Memorialist can your Committee concur;" and having thus represented the Memorial as containing "censures," it proceeds to particularize and examine them, as if they were contained in the Memorial, while in fact the Memorial contains nothing of the sort. A more extraordinary proceeding we never knew. The Committee had a Memorial referred to them which they profess to consider; and yet, without assigning a solitary reason against the illegality of the sentence under the Canon—the only point which the Memorial affirms—they make it the occasion to vindicate themselves from certain pretended "censures," of which the Memorial says nothing. Where has the Memorialist censured the Canon for its unconstitutionality? or for its *ex post facto* operation? or for its allowing a Bishop to be presented by any three Bishops? Where has he censured any Bishop or Bishops for taking part in the proceedings of the Court? Where has he censured the witnesses by making an "assault on their character," or by an "attempt to impeach their reputation for veracity?" That such censures have been made, is true enough; and that the Committee felt their force is but too evident, from the very feeble attempt they have made to answer them. But can anything be more unjust and ungenerous than for this Committee to take advantage of their position to hold up Bishop Onderdonk to public odium, as the author of these censures, when he is as innocent of them as the dumb sheep before his shearers?

But the most painfully astonishing part of this most extraordinary document, is that in which the Committee deny to Bishop Onderdonk, in the very face of his own meek profession to the contrary, the character of a penitent. "He does not stand in the position of a penitent!" Let the reader compare with these words of the Committee the Bishop's own declaration, that "in a state of almost entire seclusion from the world, he has earnestly endeavored, in reliance on the Holy Ghost, and with constant prayer for its influences, to keep a perpetual guard over his heart, to detect its evil tendencies, to discover, for greater future watchfulness, wherein they have led me astray, and to cultivate the spirit of humble penitence, meek submission, and evangelical faith and devotion." Of a document which denies the author of these words the position of a penitent, we shall only say, that if it breathes the spirit of the Gospel of Christ, we have yet to learn what the Gospel is.

True, Bishop Onderdonk has not confessed himself guilty of the particular acts charged on him by his Presenters, and of immorality and impurity, as found by the Court. But when a most respectable minority of the Court declared at the time their total dissent from the majority; when appeal has been made to the Church at large and the public, and followed by a like division of opinion; and when, after three years spent in seclusion and the most exemplary devotion, Bishop Onderdonk most solemnly declares that he has earnestly endeavored, during all this time, to cultivate the

spirit of humble penitence, did the Gospel of Christ require this Committee to repel him, with the rude declaration that he is not a penitent, and thus, by manifest implication, to declare their own triumphant majority infallible in judgment, and their prostrate brother a hypocrite at heart?

The truth of Bishop Onderdonk's plea of Not Guilty gains strength, and must continue to gain strength, by time. Every new contumely heaped upon him makes him a brighter example of Christian humility and sincerity. The six Bishops, also, who found him innocent, have done nothing to impair confidence in their original judgments, which are more and more commending themselves to the approbation of the Church. Can we say so much of the majority? To say nothing of past developments, what proof does the above Report furnish of sound and impartial judgment on the part of its signers?—*Churchman*, Dec. 4, 1847.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE NEW-YORK CONVENTION OF 1847.

At the General Convention of 1847, the Deputation from the Diocese of New-York presented the following resolutions from the Convention of that Diocese, passed September 30th, 1847:

On motion of the Rev. Dr. Forbes, it was *unanimously Resolved*, as the solemn conviction of this Convention, That justice to the Church in the Diocese of New-York, as well as its best interests, demand that it be relieved from its present anomalous position.

Resolved, That the General Convention be, and is hereby requested to give to the Church in this Diocese such relief as may be consistent with its powers.

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing Resolutions be transmitted to the next General Convention.

Attest,

BENJAMIN I. HAIGHT,
Secretary.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1847.

The action taken by the General Convention upon the above resolutions is well set forth in the following able paper, from the pen of the Rev. Dr. Seabury, which appeared as an editorial in *The Churchman*, of November 13th, 1847:

In reviewing the proceedings of the General Convention in relation to the affairs of our Bishop and Diocese, we cannot refrain from an expression of satisfaction to find that most of the principles contended for by this journal have been confirmed and put beyond dispute. We have contended that Dr. Onderdonk, though suspended, is still the Bishop of the Diocese, so that the Diocese is not vacant; and this view has been clearly taken by the General Convention. We have opposed the scheme of an election by the Diocese of an Assistant Bishop possessed of full Episcopal powers and authority, and this scheme has received no countenance from the General Convention. We have contended against the lawfulness of the sentence of indefinite suspension, and the General Convention has sustained the correctness of this view for the future, having provided by Canon that hereafter no such punishment shall be known in the Church. On all these points the General Convention has been manifestly governed by principle; and it is satisfactory to us to know that in those matters in which they could freely legislate from principle alone, and without having their course warped by

a regard to present expediency—that is to say, in every measure which would not lead to an instant resumption of duties on the part of our unfortunate Bishop—they have arrived at the conclusions which we have maintained and advocated.

It must be owned that these points are of great importance; and though the House of Deputies have not come up to the measure of our expectations, yet we gratefully acknowledge that much of their action has been in the right direction, and tended, in some degree, to check encroachments on our ecclesiastical liberties.

1. The first result which we notice is the decision that the Right Rev. Dr. Onderdonk is, in law and fact, the Bishop of the Diocese.

This point had been virtually settled in our own Diocese. It is true that the Trustees of the Episcopal Fund had refused to pay the Bishop his salary except under instruction from the Convention, though the refusal may have been, and we believe was, rested on other grounds than that of his having ceased to be Bishop of the Diocese; it is true, also, that attempts have been made in Convention to prove the vacancy of the Diocese. But the Convention itself has done nothing to sanction this view. On the contrary, by authorizing the payment to the Bishop of a portion of the income of the Episcopal Fund,* the Convention have recognized his title to the office. Moreover, the Bishop, during the whole time of his suspension, has occupied the Episcopal residence without let or molestation. The question of vacancy, therefore, may be regarded as having been virtually settled in our own Diocese. Still, it was a question which was agitated, and it is impossible to say to what disastrous results the constant agitation of it might have led. Now, however, that the sense of the General Convention has been had on the subject, we may consider the question as effectually set at rest. At least, if the question is to be agitated, we shall be now in a stronger position than ever to meet it; so that, in any event, the Bishop, and the sound principles which are, as we conceive, identified with the recognition of his right to his Diocesan office, have gained much by the action of the General Convention. Not only Bishop Onderdonk, but every Diocesan Bishop in the Church, is, in virtue of this action, more firmly seated on his throne; for once let the doctrine prevail, that Episcopal jurisdiction comes from the people, and a Diocese which has become, from whatever cause, dissatisfied with its Bishop, will never want for an excuse to revoke the jurisdiction which it fancies it has conferred. We have reason, therefore, to congratulate the Church that an adherence to principle on the part of the Clerical and Lay Deputies, and a just perception of their interests on the part of the Bishops, have arrested and effectually put down the infatuation which aimed to expel Bishop Onderdonk from his See.

2. The plan of an Assistant Bishop to be invested with full Episcopal power and authority and independent of the lawful Bishop of the Diocese, is another rock on which we might have been wrecked, and which we are thankful to have escaped. We have objected to this plan as at variance with sound views of Episcopacy, and as tending to aggravate the condition of the Bishop by leaving him on the termination of the operation of the sentence, deprived of a portion of the rights which he had before the sentence was pronounced.

3. The third result effected by the Convention, is the prohibition of all indefinite suspensions for the future. We can imagine no circumstances under which such suspensions are justifiable; no good reason why every sentence of suspension ought not to be limited by a time, at the expiration

* \$2,500 *per annum*, with the Episcopal residence.

of which, or a condition, on the performance of which, it should expire. We cannot see that it is any less tyrannical to punish a man without trial than to *keep* him punished without trial. To suspend a clergyman on any charge, say of intemperance, on the accusation of secret informers, and without allowing him a fair trial, would be thought an exercise of tyranny, but if a clergyman has been suspended on this charge, is it less tyrannical to *retain* his sentence on the accusation of secret informers, and without allowing him the opportunity of a public trial to rebut these accusations? We trow not; and we therefore rejoice, with a joy proportioned to our hatred of tyranny, that the General Convention has provided against the occurrence of any such sentence for the future. For this result our thanks are exclusively due to the House of Deputies, whose firm and manly resistance to the encroachments of the Bishops in this matter are above all praise.

In proportion, however, as we admire the conduct of the Deputies on this point, we must deplore the inconsistency by which they have given with one hand what they have withheld with the other. They have taken the ground that for the future there shall be no indefinite suspensions, and to this ground the Bishops came, though with manifest reluctance. But, on the other hand, they have consented to empower the Bishops to "remit or terminate" a judicial sentence, or to "modify the same so far as to designate a precise period of time, or other specific condition, on the occurrence of which such sentence shall be of no further force or effect." In other words, they have empowered the Bishops to *retain* a judicial sentence during their pleasure; to continue a man in a state of punishment from year to year without assigning themselves, or giving him the opportunity to know and refute, the reasons which they may have for this continued renewal of his punishment. The Canon, as first reported by the joint Committee, vested this power with the House of Bishops; but as the House of Bishops cannot be constitutionally recognized as a judicial body, the Canon was so modified as to vest the authority in the Bishops not acting as a House. But if the Bishops do not meet as a House or Court, who has the right to inspect their Minutes? or who can know aught of the proceedings? They may not only sit with closed doors, but their doings may be *kept* secret till the Day of Judgment. Thus, in order to escape from one difficulty our legislators have run into a greater, and erected a body which has no analogy in history, except in the Inquisition of Venice, or other omnipotent irresponsibilities! So utterly vain is the attempt to get round an *illegal* sentence, every expedient to escape from it, save the only honest one of declaring its nullity, only serving to add one incongruity to another.

By providing against indefinite suspensions for the future, the General Convention have plainly declared their disapprobation of such sentence, and virtually condemned it in the two instances in which it has been actually imposed. By empowering the Bishops by Canon to terminate such sentence, they have, in effect, acknowledged that no such power before existed under our Canons. The Convention has thus sanctioned the premises from which the illegality of the sentence, in the case of Bishop Onderdonk, is a necessary conclusion. We certainly must regret that the Convention has not declared expressly, what they have declared by the strongest implication. We regret it for the sake of the Bishop of this Diocese, whose hard fate it is to be the only man in our Church on whom an Ecclesiastical Court ever has imposed, or, while our Canons stand as they are, ever can impose a sentence of indefinite suspension. We regret it for the sake of this Diocese, a majority of which would, we believe, have rejoiced in the lib-

eration of their Bishop; and we regret it still more for the sake of the General Convention, whose reputation for equal legislation has not, we fear, been raised by their allowing the Bishop of this Diocese to continue under a disability, the injustice of which they have acknowledged, and the possibility of which they have prevented in all other cases; in other words, by their virtually excepting one man from the benignant operation of a salutary law.

We are aware that the Deputies, in adopting this measure, did not act (for they could not have acted) from the counsel of the Jewish High Priest Caiphas, that "it is expedient that one man should die for the people, and the whole nation perish not." They did not consent to sacrifice Bishop Onderdonk to the clamor that his return to the active duties of the Episcopate would be injurious to his Diocese and to the Church at large. On the contrary, they were led, some of them at least, into this very measure from an honest desire to serve Bishop Onderdonk and effect his liberation. They knew that the fourteen Bishops who were committed against him, would set their faces like flint against every direct attempt to terminate the sentence, and they hoped to gain from these Bishops ultimately, by conciliation, an end which they could not obtain directly by opposition. We are far from thinking that this was the only motive, but we have reason to believe that it was one of the motives which led to the clothing of the Bishops with the power of remission and modification of judicial sentences. But, grateful as we are for the motive, we think the course wrong, both in principle and policy. It is wrong, we think, in principle to subject the liberty and interest of one man to the arbitrary will of others, and equally so to deprive a Diocese of the benefits of the presence of its lawful Bishop, in the House of Bishops, during the arbitrary will and pleasure of an irresponsible body. And equally fatal, we fear, is the mistake in policy; for had the House of Deputies boldly and firmly planted themselves on the ground of right and law; had they said expressly, what they have said by the strongest implication, that it was never designed by the Canon that a Bishop should be virtually deposed under the name of suspension, and that a Diocese should have its Bishop *indefinitely* excluded from the House of Bishops, and its parishes *indefinitely* deprived of Episcopal supervision, they would have arrayed themselves, as it seems to us, in a panoply of reason, justice, and law, too strong for the fourteen Bishops to resist. But what have our Bishop and Diocese *now* to hope from the Bishops, when our strong ground has been taken from under us by the concession of the House of Deputies, and the Bishops are left to act out toward us their own good pleasure and discretion. It is a pretty safe maxim, we think, that men who are inexorable to the voice of reason, are not less inexorable when placed in a position in which *stat pro ratione voluntas*.

We hope that these remarks will not be taken to indicate a disposition to cast blame on the Deputies, or a feeling of discontent with the result. When we look back at the course of our own Diocesan Convention; when we remember that the clergy and lay delegates of our own Diocese did not expressly assert the wrongs done to their Bishop and Diocese, and did not demand redress for their wrongs from the General Convention; that not even an effort was made by either of the contending parties in our own Convention, in behalf of the principles by which they were respectively governed, but that both consented to merge their differences and coalesce in an unanimous request for "relief," it would be strange, indeed, if we were disposed to blame the House of Deputies for availing themselves of the latitude of a request which would be satisfied with any form and degree

of relief which, consistently with the Constitution and Canons of the Church, might be granted. And when we consider that the main anxiety has been in many quarters to obtain relief for the Diocese with little or no regard to the Bishop, it would be stranger still if we who confess to the deeper solicitude for the party who is in the greater need, should not be satisfied with a result which, without relieving the Diocese, puts the Bishop in a stronger position than he was before.

The position of the Bishop is stronger, not only because it is now beyond reasonable dispute that he is the Bishop of the Diocese, but because, as such, he will now be the centre of unity around which all sound Churchmen will rally; some from mere principle, and only with the resolution to do nothing to aggravate his condition; and others, whose confidence in his integrity is unshaken, not only from principle, but from affection also, and with a determination to use every honorable means to promote his interests.

But we cannot see that the position of the Diocese is changed for the better by the action of the General Convention. The proceedings of the Standing Committee have been legalized; and so far the Diocese is practically in the same condition as before. The Convention, indeed, is authorized to put the Diocese under the charge of the Bishop of another Diocese, or of a Missionary Bishop; but supposing that the Convention consents to have this one See filled, for a time, by two Bishops, it will yet be but for a time, and they will still be looking forward to "relief." To whom are they to look? Not, as before, to the General Convention, consisting of a House of Bishops and a House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, governed by known rules and Canons, but to a majority of the Bishops acting from their own good pleasure and discretion. The "relief," then, which the Diocese has obtained, is a change of the tribunal to which it looks for "relief." It *had* a General Convention, in which it was itself represented, to which it could apply for "relief." It *has*, *pro hac vice*, a provincial council in which its voice will be powerless except it be raised in the tone of entreaty and supplication.

We have made up our mind that this state of things is to continue, in all human probability, for a long time to come. With so large a number as fourteen previously committed against him, Bishop Onderdonk has small reason to expect a relaxation of his sentence on the part of the Bishops. The sentence, indeed, remains the same as ever; if it were unlawful before the last General Convention, it is unlawful now; an *ex post facto* law cannot legitimate an *ex post facto* sentence; but as the Diocese has not, so it is fair to suppose it will not, dispute the lawfulness of the sentence. These, we believe, are the only two ways in which an honorable or desirable "relief" can be obtained; and as we have no hope for either, we have concluded to be content with our lot, thankful that it is no worse, and to discharge the duties belonging to it with as much evenness and composure as if it were to last for life. Stability is one great end of legislation, and to that, we believe, the General Convention has contributed.

Second Movement

FOR THE

RESTORATION OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

PRELIMINARY MEASURES.

THE Rev. Dr. Sherwood offered certain resolutions in the New-York Convention of 1848, concerning the restoration of the Bishop, which were laid over for consideration until the Convention of 1849, when the subject was again introduced. Among the resolutions offered was one by the Rev. Dr. [now Bishop] Whitehouse, "earnestly and affectionately begging the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk to resign the jurisdiction of the Diocese of New-York," and in that event pledging the Diocese to pay him two thousand dollars *per annum* for the term of his natural life, and in the event of his decease, with her survivorship, the sum of one thousand dollars, yearly, to his widow; and also promising that the Convention would then unite in an earnest petition that the said Bishop may be relieved from all disabilities, and restored to the full exercise of such clerical and Episcopal functions as are allowed to a Bishop who has resigned his jurisdiction. The vote upon this resolution was as follows:

	<i>Ayes.</i>	<i>Noes.</i>
Clergy.....	30	98
Laity.....	44	70
	<hr/> 74	<hr/> 168

So the motion was lost.

The Rev. Dr. Sherwood's resolutions were superseded by that of the Rev. Dr. Higbee, which was more concise, requesting the Standing Committee to present, at an early day, an address to the House of Bishops, praying them to adopt such measures as might render the wise intent of the provision of the 3d Canon of 1847 (enacting that thereafter all sentences of suspension should specify on what terms, or at what time, the penalty should cease) available to the relief of the Diocese of New-York. Although the Canonical application was made, in October, 1849, requesting the calling of a special meeting of the Bishops, such meeting was

not convened till the 1st of October following, the day before the regular meeting of the General Convention: an evasion of the Canon which called forth strong censures from some of the ablest members of the House of Deputies. In pursuance of the authority committed to them, the Standing Committee caused to be prepared by a Sub-Committee of their number, and adopted the following very able document. The facts of the case are faithfully and impartially stated, and the principles involved are most powerfully and lucidly set forth. The injustice done to the Diocese and its Diocesan is written clearly, as with a sunbeam; and is more forcibly stated by the few masterly strokes of the able pen of the accomplished author, than could be done by volumes of declamation.

THE PRAYER

Of the Diocese of New-York, to the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for relief from sufferings consequent on the Sentence of the Episcopal Court, in January, 1845.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND THE BISHOPS OF THE PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

Right Reverend Fathers: In a notice transmitted to you through our Secretary, in October last, we had the honor to apprise you severally that we had been instructed by our Convention to address you as a body, in reference to the present sad state of our Diocese, and to ask of you that relief which the legislation of the Church has opened the way for you to afford.

As preliminary to the matter in hand, we submit the following facts:

The General Convention of 1844, passed a Canon (the third of that year) entitled, "Of the Trial of a Bishop," which provides for the infliction of a penalty in the following, and no other words:

"And if it be that the accused is guilty, the Court shall, at the same time, pass sentence, and award the penalty of admonition, suspension, or deposition, as to them the offence or offences proved may seem to deserve."

The General Convention of that year adjourned on the 22d of October, and on the 9th day of the month following, a presentment was served on our Bishop, the Right Reverend Dr. B. T. Onderdonk, charging offences alleged to have been committed at sundry specified times between June, 1837, and July, 1842. On the 10th of December, 1844, a Court of Bishops met in this city for the trial of our Bishop, under the aforesaid Canon; and having tried and adjudged him "guilty," pronounced his sentence, on the 3d of January, 1845, in the following words:

"It is hereby ordered and declared, that the sentence by this Court upon the Respondent is suspension from the office of a Bishop in the Church of God, and from all the functions of the sacred ministry—and this Court do hereby solemnly *pronounce* and *declare*, that the Right Reverend Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk is suspended from all exercise of his Episcopal and ministerial functions."

In September, 1847, the Convention of our Diocese adopted unanimously the following resolutions, to be transmitted to the next General Convention:

"*Resolved*, As the solemn conviction of this Convention, that justice to

the Church in the Diocese of New-York, as well as its best interests, demand that it be relieved from its present anomalous position.

"Resolved, That the General Convention be, and is hereby requested to give to the Church in this Diocese, such relief as may be consistent with its powers."

In October, of the same year, the General Convention met, and on consideration of the application of this Diocese, enacted the following Canons, the only ones bearing on our case, which are known as the second and third Canons of that year:

"Of the Remission or Modification of Judicial Sentences."

"The Bishops of this Church who are entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, may altogether remit and terminate any judicial sentence which may have been imposed, or may hereafter be imposed, by Bishops acting collectively as a Judicial Tribunal, or modify the same so far as to designate a precise period of time or other specific contingency, on the occurrence of which, such sentence shall utterly cease and be of no further force or effect: *Provided,*" etc.

"Of the Penalty of Suspension."

"Whenever the penalty of suspension shall be inflicted on a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, the sentence shall specify on what terms, or at what time said penalty shall cease."

In September, 1849, the Convention of our Diocese adopted—by a vote of clergy, ayes 91, noes 37, and of laity, ayes 69, noes 46—the preamble and resolution (already transmitted to you and presently to be quoted) under which we address you. In October following, the canonical number of Bishops united in a respectful request to the Presiding Bishop to call a special meeting of your body in the month of February, 1850, at such time in the month, and at such place as might seem to him fit and convenient; whereupon the Presiding Bishop convoked your venerable body at Cincinnati, on the day next preceding that appointed for the opening of the General Convention in October, 1850; at which time and place the present address is designed to reach you.

From these facts the position of your memorialists may be readily inferred:

The third Canon of 1844, by distinguishing suspension from deposition, evidently intended that a sentence of suspension should define its limit. This opinion, which was intimated in 1845 by the body now addressing you, in connection with a reference to high legal opinions to show that a sentence of suspension, without a limit in terms, was void and inoperative in law, has been since ruled by the third Canon of 1847. Agreeably, however, to the letter of the Canon, the Court which tried our Bishop inflicted the penalty of "suspension," without a limit in terms. Had the sentence declared the limit of the penalty, the Diocese of New-York would have had no occasion to look beyond itself for relief from the evils which it entailed. But the sentence did not declare the limit of the penalty; nor, on the adjournment of the Court, and the consequent expiration of its powers, was there any tribunal in the Church canonically competent to declare it. Commensurate in duration with the penalty were the evils which followed it; and it was under the pressure of these evils, (evils, be it observed, growing not out of suspension, in the definite sense since ruled by the Church, but out of an *unlimited* suspension,) that the Supreme Legislature of the Church, on the first occasion of its meeting after the declaration of the sentence, was approached by our Diocese with a unanimous

prayer for relief. The General Convention promptly provided a remedy for these evils, by clothing your venerable body with a canonical power either to remit and terminate the penalty altogether, or to affix to it the limit which the sentence had failed to express, but which the Canon now requires shall be expressed in every similar sentence. Since the adjournment of the General Convention of 1847, which made this provision, the present is the first occasion of the meeting of your body; and on this occasion we come before you, in the name of our Convention, with the prayer, that you would exert for our relief the power with which you have been, for this purpose, canonically invested.

That the scope of our instructions, and the mind of our Diocese may be the better understood, we lay before you a copy of the preamble and resolution which have led to the present address:

"Whereas, the House of Bishops and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies in the General Convention of 1847, passed a Canon in the words following:

"Whenever the penalty of suspension shall be inflicted on a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, the sentence shall specify, at what time or on what terms said penalty shall cease."

"And whereas, the Diocese and Diocesan of New-York, have been for a long time suffering under the disabilities which it was the design of the Canon to prevent in future; Therefore,

"Resolved, That the Standing Committee be requested to present, at an early day, an address to the House of Bishops, praying that venerable body to adopt such measures as may render the wise intent of the provisions of said Canon of 1847, available to the relief of our Diocese: that so the objects may be accomplished of the unanimous prayer of this Convention to the General Convention of 1847."

The preamble, as will be seen, contains two clauses which are the bases of the resolution. The first shows the equitable principle of legislation on which we rely for relief; and the second shows the end or object for which the application of this principle is invoked. The principle is, that the penalty of suspension should have a declared limit; and the end of the desired application of this principle, in the present instance, is to relieve "the Diocese and Diocesan of New-York." The actual provisions of Canon III, of 1847, are, of course, not applicable to a sentence which was pronounced before the Canon was adopted; but the "wise intent," or equitable principle of these provisions is applicable to the sentence, and your venerable body have been canonically empowered to apply it. The actual provisions of the Canon demand that hereafter, in every sentence of suspension, the limit of the penalty shall be declared; the "wise intent" or equity of these provisions leads us to hope that a suspension inflicted before the adoption of the Canon, and having no declared limit, will also have its limit declared now that your venerable body have the canonical power to declare it. If the limitation is made, the effect of it will be to remove the suffering which has induced us to pray for relief; that is to say, the suffering of our Diocese and Diocesan. We are not aware that the suffering of both, the Bishop and the Diocese, can be relieved in any other way (except, indeed, by an entire remission of the penalty) than by a limitation of the penalty: so that both the principle on which we rely for relief, and the end for which we solicit it, concur in pointing to a specific measure for the accomplishment of the objects of our unanimous prayer to the General Convention of 1847.

Before we make our request, it is proper to open up its grounds by asking your attention to the nature and extent of our grievances.

Suspension, as commonly understood and as now ruled by our Canons, is a temporary deprivation of office; differing from deposition in nothing except that it has a limit of time or condition. Equally with deposition it incapacitates the person who is suffering under it for the exercise of office; and it is distinguished from deposition only by its reserving to him the right to resume the exercise of his office on the efflux of the time, or the fulfilment of the condition, which is the term or limit of the penalty.

In the case of our Bishop, however, this penalty has been inflicted without the declaration of the time or condition which is necessary in order to its limitation. In this respect, ours is a peculiar hardship; no other Diocese ever has been, or, under our existing Canons, ever can be subjected to evils flowing from the same cause; the power of your venerable body to hold the Bishop of a Diocese suspended at pleasure, and to keep his Diocese under a sentence which works all the evils of a vacancy without actually creating a vacancy, having been, on the first and only occasion of its exercise, and with your own consent, abridged and limited forever by Canon III., of 1847. And we desire, that in considering our prayer, the unlimited nature of the sentence, and the equitable bearing on it of this Canon, may be kept distinctly and constantly in view.

The effect of this sentence on our Diocese has been most disastrous.

By a fundamental principle of the Catholic Church, adopted in the fourth article of the Constitution of our own Church "every Bishop" is required to "confine the exercise of his Episcopal office to his proper Diocese, unless requested to ordain, or confirm, or perform any other act of the Episcopal Office by any Church destitute of a Bishop." The Church of New-York was wholly deprived of the services of its own Bishop, either in person or by deputy; but it was not destitute of a Bishop, and consequently not in a condition to make that request without which no other Bishop on earth could lawfully exercise his Episcopal office within her borders. Thus were we totally cut off, not for a *limited* time (this we could have borne in silence,) but for an *unlimited* time, from the benefits of that institution, which we believe to be, under God, the fountain of life to the Church. From the moment of the promulgation of the sentence, in January, 1845, the Diocese of New-York was thrown back into a state similar to that in which it was placed while New-York was a colony of Great Britain, without even that shadow of Episcopal supervision which existed when, during our colonial dependence, we were placed under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London. We had, indeed, a Bishop; but a Bishop whose hands were tied; who was unable to confirm the young, to ordain candidates for orders, to consecrate churches, to inspect our parishes, to exercise discipline, or to perform any one act of Episcopal supervision; and all this for a time of unlimited duration. And although by a liberal construction of the fourth article of the Constitution, and by special legislation grounded on the necessity of the case (a necessity which could never have been assumed to exist had the sentence contained a *limitation*), the rigor of our condition has been so far mitigated that we have been enabled to invite other Bishops into our Diocese for the performance of certain Episcopal duties, yet the evils which flow from the want of Episcopal supervision and jurisdiction still remain in their full force and operation. The Bishops who are invited to officiate in our Diocese are restrained from every act, proper to their office, which involves the power of jurisdiction. Our clergy consequently have no head who is authorized to watch over them, to advise or to admonish, to warn or to rebuke; and our parishes have no common head to inspect their condition. Our candidates for the Holy Ministry are deprived of the paternal guidance which the Church

contemplates and which they especially need. Confirmations are no longer appointed by the ecclesiastical authority of the Diocese, but are held at the pleasure of the clergy and performed by a Bishop who comes in, at the request of the Standing Committee, to give effect to their wishes. Our discipline is reduced to the cold and mechanical operation of legal processes, without a breath of that paternal and discretionary authority, which, when wisely exerted, is more efficacious for the prevention of evil than are Canons for its cure. In a Diocese so large as ours, the want of this paternal supervision is severely felt: nor can we refrain from expressing the sorrow with which we have beheld instances of clerical delinquency, not cognizable by the Canons, tending toward and at length resulting in defection from the Church, while the only voice which could be raised in an effort to arrest the evil by authoritative inquiry or remonstrance, was forbidden to speak; and difficulties between rectors and parishes, which might, in all human probability, have been healed by timely and authoritative interposition, suffered to go unchecked until they had bred confusion and scandal, and involved the parties in a litigation which ended in their great estrangement or in the rupture of the sacred tie which united them.

A special effect of this sentence is to deprive the Bishop on whom it operates of his seat in the House of Bishops; and we deem it a grievance that the Bishop of our Diocese shall have no voice in the body which is so important a branch of that legislature to whose laws we are subject, and by whose acts we are bound. Had this deprivation been limited, and had the limit extended beyond the meeting of one General Convention, we had been silent: but when this address reaches you, a second General Convention will have met, from which the Bishop of our Diocese is excluded: and the exclusion, unless you shall be pleased to order otherwise, will continue to be for an unlimited time.

And what help is there for these evils? None within our reach. If our Bishop possessed a right to jurisdiction, and were disqualified for its exercise through bodily or mental infirmity, we might choose for him an assistant or coadjutor; but he is totally, only not forever, deprived of this right, and consequently, so long as the deprivation lasts, of all capacity of receiving assistance or coöperation. If he possessed the right, and were disqualified for its exercise through his own fault, through any acts which brought discredit or dishonor on his character, a resignation of his jurisdiction, either of his own motion, or at the instance of his Diocese, would naturally ensue. But the case has been taken, not by our act, but by the act of members of your own body, from the bar of public opinion to the bar of Ecclesiastical Law. Where you have put the case, there we have been fain to leave it; without lifting a finger to divert the current of ecclesiastical justice from that channel through which the constituted authorities of the Church have ordained it to flow. If you see fit to loose the case from its legal bands, and remit it to the moral sense of the community, which has heretofore been deemed sufficient to guard the reputation of our American Episcopate, the Diocese of New-York will know, as it ever has known, what is due to itself from its Bishop; and knowing this, will not fail, as it never has failed, to maintain its own dignity and self-respect. But while the case remains in its present state we are powerless, and can look only to your venerable body for relief.

It is doubtless, however, your pleasure, Right Reverend Fathers, no less than our duty, that we bring our prayer within the bounds marked out for our relief, by the Supreme Legislature of the Church. To this end we purpose to forbear to ask of you the adoption of any measure in our be-

half, which the General Convention has forborne to sanction, and to ask of you only such a measure as the General Convention has sanctioned.

On the prayer of our Diocese to the General Convention of 1847, this body enacted no Canon either to void the jurisdiction of a suspended Bishop, or to authorize the Diocese of such Bishop to choose another Bishop, who, during this suspension, should exercise jurisdiction in his stead. In a word, the General Convention, after due deliberation, forbore to sanction, and by so doing tacitly condemned any and every measure for our relief, which would be questionable in principle, or which would relieve the Diocese without also relieving its Bishop. Confining ourselves, as in duty bound, within the limits marked out for us by the collective wisdom of the Church, we ask :

1. *For no relief to our Diocese at the expense of any principle of the Church.*

We regard the See of New-York as filled; and since the House of Bishops has been canonically empowered to remit or limit the penalty which restrains its Bishop from the exercise of his functions, the plea of necessity cannot be urged for any further departure from the Fourth Article of our Constitution, or rather from the fundamental principle on which this article is founded, that the Church of every Diocese is one body, of which its Bishop is the head. It is enough that our Diocese, though not vacant, invites other Bishops to perform within it Episcopal acts not involving jurisdiction. To acknowledge another centre of jurisdiction until the Diocese shall have been lawfully vacated, to transfer to another Bishop the canonical obedience which, although temporarily interrupted, is yet due to our present Diocesan, is a measure for which, we believe, our Diocese is not prepared. We ask :

2. *For no relief to our Diocese at the expense of any of the rights of our Bishop.*

Without presuming to indicate the views of the Diocese, or of any portion of it, on questions involved in the trial of our Bishop, such questions being foreign to the duty at present devolved upon us, we do not hesitate to say that there is one principle by which, since the termination of the trial, our Diocese has been governed; and that is, to do nothing which would either increase or diminish the legal force and effect of the sentence. Duty to the authority which pronounced the sentence has forbidden the one, and duty to him who suffers the sentence has forbidden the other; and in the equal discharge of both duties we have sought to abide by the penalty, the whole penalty, and nothing but the penalty. The lawful force of the penalty, however, allows and requires, that the subject of it, in the event of its expiration, *shall be possessed of all the canonical rights which he had before its infliction.* To solicit or instigate any infraction of the penalty would be an act of contempt to the tribunal which awarded it: to solicit or instigate any measure which would involve a forfeiture of reverential rights, or lessen the chance of their recovery, would be an act of bad faith and injustice to the suspended Bishop: and as no past act of our Convention has cast disrespect on the Court, so none has given us reason to believe that a measure which would aim to relieve the Diocese, at the expense of the rights of the Diocesan, would meet the wishes of the Diocese, or receive its active concurrence.

But the guidance of the General Convention in this matter is not merely negative. It has legislated positively in view of our case, and its legislation embraces two, and only two provisions available to our relief. Of

these the one empowers your body to "altogether remit and terminate any judicial sentence which may have been imposed," and the other to "modify the same so as to designate a precise period of time, or other specific contingency, on the occurrence of which such sentence shall utterly cease and be of no further force or effect." The former provision authorizes you to grant an instant and unconditional remission of the penalty under consideration; and it authorizes you, also, it is believed, as a House of Bishops, to review the proceedings of the Court, and, should you see fit, to rescind its sentence: while the latter provision invites us to the more moderate course of praying you, without raising a question on the proceedings of the Court, to assign to the penalty the limit which the sentence has failed to express. It is also worthy of note, as indicating more precisely the intention of the General Convention, that the latter provision is, while the former is not, adapted to the case of our Diocese alone, exclusively of all other Dioceses now and forever. For your body will be forever liable to be called on to remit and terminate a judicial sentence; but you are not now, nor, inasmuch as every future sentence of suspension must contain its own limitation, will you ever hereafter be moved, as a House of Bishops, to limit a suspension in the case of any other Diocesan than the Bishop of New-York.

Guided, then, by the Supreme Authority of the Church, and by the resolution under which we address you, which point to one and the same specific measure of relief, we come now, Right Reverend Fathers, distinctly to prefer our prayer; which is, that in consideration of the sufferings of our Bishop and Diocese, under a sentence of suspension which has no declared limit, you would proceed in virtue of your power under the second Canon of 1847, to declare the limit of the penalty by the designation of an early day on which the penalty shall cease, and be of no further force or effect.

We ask for a limitation, instead of a remission, because a limitation of the penalty provides for its exhaustion. When the limit of the penalty under consideration shall have been defined by competent authority, and that limit shall have been reached, the whole amount of punishment decreed by the Court will have been suffered; and the honor of the Court and of the Church will have been amply vindicated.

We ask for a limitation of time, instead of condition, because:

1. A limitation of time is a direct and effectual method to secure the desired relief; and the same reasons which move us to pray for relief, move us also to pray for the adoption of such a measure of relief as is direct and effectual, in preference to any other which is indirect and uncertain. Because:

2. A condition involving the merits of the case, when the case is not to be rejudged, ought in equity, we think, to be declared by no other tribunal than that which declared the sentence. That tribunal, however, is no longer in existence; and if it were, there is no harshness in supposing that in the interval of nearly six years, events may have transpired which it would desire to take into consideration in any new action involving the merits of the case. The House of Bishops have the power, indeed, to modify the sentence by annexing to it a condition of this nature; but we respectfully submit to their consideration, whether a condition which could have been justly inserted in the sentence, might not now, after the lapse of nearly six years' patient and submissive endurance, operate as an aggravation of the penalty; and whether it would not be in effect to reaffirm the decision of the Court without granting the suspended Bishop the benefit of a rehearing. And because:

3. A condition not involving the merits of the case, unless, indeed, it were merely nominal, would have the effect either, 1. To peril a fundamental principle of our Church, and the sacred rights of our Diocesan; or, 2. To take the ultimate determination and issue of the penalty from your venerable body, with whom we desire to leave it, and make it dependent on contingencies less favorable to the peace and tranquillity of the Church.

But that our motives in this particular may not be misunderstood, we beg to assure you of our distinct and unwavering conviction that, as respects the subject of this penalty, all the ends contemplated by a conditional limitation, will have been attained in the fulness of their spirit. He has borne his protracted sufferings with the most patient and dutiful submission; and whatever opinions he, in common with others, may have honestly entertained on abstract questions deeply affecting his interests, he has led, beyond question, from the time he was so unhappy as to incur the displeasure of his brethren, a most devout, guarded, and exemplary life.

It must be understood, however, Right Reverend Fathers, that we approach you on this present occasion, not as partizans of the suspended Bishop, but as representatives of the Diocese. In all that we have deprecated, and in what we have solicited at your hands, we have been swayed by no other motives than by those which we have frankly avowed. Ulterior purposes do not enter into our present application. Questions of a mere personal bearing have had no power either to draw us to, or to turn us from, the point of our request. To this we have been led, as we believe, solely by the general legislation of the Church, by the dictates of immutable justice and equity, and by the spirit of the instructions under which we act—all which have concurred to fix our minds on the specific measure which we have urged, as the only one by which the desired relief can be equitably and honorably attained.

It is due to you, also, that we here state, with entire frankness, what we suppose to be the precise effect of this measure which we ask you to adopt, and the relative responsibility devolved by it on your venerable body and on our Diocese.

The immediate and necessary effect of the limitation and consequent expiration of the penalty will be, we apprehend, simply to reinstate our Bishop in the full possession of his rights of office and jurisdiction by removing all legal let or impediment to their exercise. The actual performance of Episcopal services in the Diocese, may or may not be consequent on the expiration of the penalty, but will not, we apprehend, be its immediate and necessary effect. As matters now stand, every avenue to relief is closed; the penalty, while it operates, presenting an impassable barrier of indeterminate duration, not only to the full communication of our Diocese with any other Bishop, but to all communication of the Diocese with its own Bishop. But if the penalty be limited, the immediate and necessary effect of the limitation, when the limit shall have been reached, will be, we suppose, simply to bring the Bishop into living connection with his Diocese, and to put both Diocese and Diocesan in a capacity to unite and co-operate in the adoption of measures for the common good.

And in this effect we recognize the line which divides the responsibility of your venerable body from that of our Diocese.

On this point, we would have it considered, that the suspension of a Diocesan Bishop is a punishment which the Church has decreed. It was decreed by the General Convention of 1841, and again decreed by the General Convention of 1844. Your own House, also, in 1844, adopted a Canon, which provided that, "In case of the limited suspension of any Bishop,

the Standing Committee of any Diocese of such suspended Bishop may apply to the Bishop or Bishops of this Church to perform Episcopal duties within such Diocese;" and the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies also, although it did not concur in the Canon, yet adopted the section of it which contains the above provision, expunging only the word *limited*, on the ground, as is believed, that suspension is, in its own nature, a limited penalty. In view of all this, it was further enacted in 1847, that every suspension, that of a Diocesan Bishop included, hereafter inflicted, shall be limited. This repeated action shows that the whole subject has been distinctly and maturely considered. Now, it is hardly to be expected that the penalty of suspension should work itself out on any Diocesan Bishop without rendering a portion, and possibly a large portion, of his Diocese averse to the reception of his services; such a consequence is natural and too obvious to have escaped attention; but the Church has decreed, notwithstanding, that, on the expiration of the penalty, the Bishop and his Diocese shall again be brought into active connection. The inference which we draw from this is, that all ulterior questions, all beyond the immediate and necessary effect of limitation, are to be settled by the Bishop and Diocese between themselves. The supreme authority of the Church inflicts the punishment, guards it in its progress, and brings it to an end, and there leaves the parties more immediately concerned in it to take care of themselves. A Bishop and Diocese, on coming together again after such an interruption of their intercourse, must expect to contend with some difficulties and perplexities; but the cure for these evils would seem to be in local and Diocesan regulations, and not in the higher and more general authorities of the Church. It may be that the state of the Diocese will be such as to render the voluntary retirement of the Bishop from his charge desirable for his own peace and the good of the Church; or it may be deemed expedient that the Bishop should give the Diocese the benefit of his counsel and general supervision, but refrain from the visitation of parishes; or, again, it may be thought best that he should visit some parts of his Diocese in person, while the visitation of other parts should be delegated to another Bishop. It is impossible to predict, with any degree of precision, what the state of a Diocese, in such an event, would be, or what measures would be best adapted to promote its peace and welfare. But be the difficulties of the case what they may, as the Church did not need to be particularly informed of them before she prescribed limitation in every case in which a Diocesan Bishop shall be suspended, so it cannot be necessary, in the present instance, to press them on your attention. The Church, in her collective capacity, has assumed that the limitation of the penalty is the point at which her immediate responsibility ceases and that of the Diocese begins; and if the evils naturally consequent on such an event have not deterred her from making limitation the universal rule, they will be of no force, we apprehend, to deter your venerable body from applying the equity of this rule to the particular case under consideration. The Church herself has placed that confidence in every Diocese as to suppose that, when an emergency, such as is here contemplated, shall arise, it will be able to cope with its difficulties in the spirit of wisdom and charity; and we trust that you, Right Reverend Fathers, have no reason to withdraw from the Diocese of New-York that confidence which the General Convention has reposed in her, in common with other Dioceses. Let the equitable provisions of the General Convention take their natural course, and we fear no evils which may not, by God's blessing, be averted, and made to redound to the welfare of the Church, and to furnish new proofs of her stability.

We find ourselves, Right Reverend Fathers, addressing you under very remarkable circumstances. We had supposed that the benefits of the Episcopacy, subject only to such temporary interruptions as are caused by vacancies, had been secured to us forever; and we have been taught to be thankful to Divine Providence for the blessing, and to hold in honor the names of the great and good men, now gone to their rest, through whose pious labors and sacrifices it was obtained. But we now find ourselves deprived of this blessing by an interruption which has no limit, and the end of which, unless your venerable body shall declare it, no human foresight can predict. We had supposed that the rights and liberties of every member of our Church were secured by law, and not left dependent on the will of arbitrary and irresponsible power; and we have rejoiced in the confidence which this security imparts. But we now find ourselves, in a matter involving the rights and liberty of a Bishop of the Church, and the rights and welfare of a Diocese which numbers its clergy by hundreds, and its communicants by thousands, thrown entirely on your mercy, suing for what we believe to be a simple act of justice, without a Canon to enforce our suit, and before a tribunal which may grant or refuse our prayer of its own mere pleasure, and on its responsibility to God and its conscience alone. In this most extraordinary position we have two sources of consolation. The first is, that of all our confederated Churches, the Church of New-York is alone in this state of dependence, and that all are now shielded, by express canonical provisions, from similar privations in future. The other is, that a power so dangerous and capable of abuse in unworthy hands, is, in the present instance, vested in the Order of Bishops, and in members of that Order who belong to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. These considerations go far to reconcile us to our position, because they assure us that the power at whose disposal we are placed, and whose interposition we invite, will be exercised in the spirit of wisdom and clemency, "not for destruction, but for salvation—not to hurt, but to help," and under a due sense of responsibility to the great Shepherd and Bishop of Souls.

In conclusion, we beg to assure you, Right Reverend Fathers, of our sincere and fervent wishes for your health and prosperity in Christ Jesus our Lord.

On behalf and by order of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New-York.

WILLIAM BERRIAN, D. D., *President.*

BENJAMIN I. HAIGHT, D. D., *Secretary.*

NEW-YORK, September 19, 1850.

The foregoing Address was adopted at a meeting of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New-York, duly convened, on Thursday, the 19th day of September, A. D. 1850, and ordered to be transmitted to the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, at their meeting in Cincinnati, on Tuesday, the 1st day of October.

(Attest),

BENJAMIN I. HAIGHT, *Secretary.*

NEW-YORK, September 25, 1850.

REPLY OF THE BISHOPS.

HOUSE OF BISHOPS,
CINCINNATI, October 12th, 1850. }

REV. WILLIAM BERRIAN, D. D.,

President of the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New-York :

Rev. and Dear Sir : Agreeably to instructions of the Bishops in Council, I have the honor to transmit to you the accompanying Report and Resolutions. The Resolutions were passed by the Bishops in Council, Friday, October 11th, 1850.

Yours very respectfully,

GEORGE D. GILLESPIE, *Secretary pro tem.*

The Committee, to whom was referred the papers relating to the Diocese of New-York, and the case of its suspended Bishop, beg leave respectfully to report :

That they have had the same under consideration. These papers consist of a resolution, adopted by the Convention of New-York in 1849 ; of a memorial, drawn up and adopted at a meeting of its Standing Committee, regularly convened in the city of New-York, September 19th, 1850, soliciting a modification or remission of the sentence pronounced by the Court of Bishops upon the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk ; and of two memorials, the one numerously signed by individuals, the other from the Rector, Wardens, and Vestry of St. George's Church, in the city of New-York ; both praying this body not to restore the suspended Bishop to the exercise of his Episcopal functions, and especially to the exercise of jurisdiction in the Diocese of New-York.

In none of the memorials is immediate restoration asked for, nor is it implied that it is the general wish of the Diocese that the suspended Bishop should again become its active head. On the contrary, it is distinctly intimated in the memorial of the Standing Committee, that the remission of the sentence might not be sufficient to enable the suspended Bishop to resume his visitations, but might necessarily be followed by his abstaining permanently from them, or by the resignation of his jurisdiction, to which resignation he has, in the opinion of your Committee, ever been competent ; and whatever doubts may have been entertained on this point by some others, must now be removed by the Canon passed at this session of the General Convention, making special provision for such a case. Still the Standing Committee argue, that a limitation of the penalty, by the designation of an early day on which the penalty shall cease, and be of no further force and effect, is the only measure of relief which is consistent with sound principles, or likely to afford full satisfaction.

It will be remembered that, so far as the Diocese is concerned, an application for relief, from what was termed its anomalous position, was made to the General Convention of 1847, by the Diocesan Convention of New-York ; and that at the same session application was made by the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk to the Bishops, praying that they would open the way for his personal relief from the sentence of suspension, under which he was laboring.

In answer to the first of these applications, as well as out of regard to high considerations of duty and expediency, the General Convention of 1847 did enact three Canons (known as Canons 2, 3, and 4, of the General Convention of 1847), which would compromise, it was understood, no important principle maintained by any of the parties interested, and which, if fairly tried, might be expected to afford to the Diocese sufficient relief from the difficulties under which it was thought to labor.

To one of the most important of these Canons (the 4th of 1847), no reference is made in the argument of the Standing Committee; there has been no attempt, it is believed, to secure the full care and jurisdiction of a Bishop, as provided for in its second section; and the Canon itself is treated as if it had no existence.

The Committee conceive, that before renewing its application for relief, the Diocese ought to have made trial of the means already provided, especially as they are means which were adopted on the basis of a fraternal compromise, and which were understood to have received the concurrence of the representatives of that Diocese at the time.

If, however, additional legislation shall seem good to the wisdom of the General Convention now assembled, the individuals composing the Committee will cheerfully co-operate in their capacity as members of the House of Bishops.

In regard to the suspended Bishop himself, it is sufficient to remark, that his case received the careful and anxious consideration of his brethren, the Bishops of this Church, in 1847. It was then distinctly declared in the Report of the Committee, that in the absence of any proof or even allegation of his innocence, of any profession of penitence, and of any sufficient evidence that the penalty, under which he was suffering, was inconsistent with law or equity, a remission ought not to be expected, and could not be allowed. In all these respects the position of his case remains unchanged. The Committee are therefore at a loss to conceive on what grounds the Bishops could justify themselves in fixing any precise time at which the force and effect of the sentence should cease. No mere lapse of time can transform guilt into innocence, nor make him worthy to exercise the office of a Bishop in the Church of God, who, by the solemn sentence of its highest tribunal, has been once declared to be unworthy.

The Committee, in conclusion, propose for adoption the following resolutions:—

Resolved, That the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New-York, and the other memorialists, have leave to withdraw their memorials.

Resolved, That a copy of this report, and the accompanying resolutions, be transmitted by the Secretary of this House to the Standing Committee of the Diocese of New-York.

(Signed),

T. C. BROWNELL,
JOHN H. HOPKINS,
ALFRED LEE,
J. P. K. HENSHAW,
ALONZO POTTER.

A true copy.

(Attest).

GEO. D. GILLESPIE, *Secretary pro tem.*

This document, and the proceedings in relation to it, do not appear in the Journal of the General Convention—the House of Bishops having resolved (see Journal of 1850, pp. 101, 102), to provide “a Special [secret] Journal of the Proceedings” of the Council into which they were about to resolve themselves.

It will be observed that their reply to the Standing Committee was, characteristically, based upon opposition memorials, outside influences, and

the *infallibility* of the original judgment of the Court. No comment is required in this place—the able article from the pen of Dr. Seabury, on the answer of the Bishops to the Memorial, in 1847 (see p. 101), having effectually disposed of the arguments here repeated respecting the Bishop himself.

ACTION OF THE GENERAL CONVENTION OF 1850.

At the General Convention of 1850, a Canon (see Digest, Section 6, Canon 13 of Title I.), was passed, providing for the election of a Provisional Bishop, who should exercise all the power and authority of the Bishop of the Diocese during the suspension of such Bishop, and who, in case of the remission of the sentence of the Bishop, and his restoration to the exercise of his jurisdiction, should perform the duties of Assistant Bishop prescribed by Canon VI. of 1832,* and who, in all cases, should succeed to the Bishop on his death or resignation. The New-York Deputies (Rev. Drs. Sherwood, Higbee, and Seabury), voted against this Canon; and the dissatisfaction of the Diocese respecting the arrangement may be gathered from the fact that the Special Convention, called for the purpose of taking action under it, adjourned without being able to accomplish their object.

The Rev. Dr. Creighton was elected by the Convention of 1851, but he afterwards declined. In 1852, the Rev. Dr. Wainwright was elected, and consecrated November 10th, of the same year. He departed this life on the 21st of September, 1854; and, at the next meeting of the Convention, the Rev. Dr. H. Potter was elected to succeed him in the Provisional administration of the Diocese.

* This Canon provides that "the Assistant Bishop shall perform such Episcopal duties, and exercise such Episcopal authority in the Diocese, as the Bishop shall assign to him."

Proposed Civil Suit.

In the year 1853 a layman of the Church in this city employed counsel, who prepared an elaborate Opinion, designed for trial before a civil court, with a view to ascertain the right of Bishop Onderdonk to the full amount of the salary provided for his office, as well as to test the validity of the sentence of suspension passed upon him, a question, by the way, of grave importance; for, surely no American citizen should rest satisfied with the present organization of Ecclesiastical Courts, whose so-called judicial proceedings, based as they frequently are upon the rancor of strife and party feeling, oftentimes convert the court itself into an instrument of persecution; and, as a general thing, are much more likely to result in tyranny and oppression and in damage to the State, than in any good to society, or the Church.

It is no trifling illustration of what we say, that the House of Bishops have, since the sentence was passed upon Bishop Onderdonk, acknowledged their proceedings, as an ecclesiastical court, to have been hasty and illegal; and that, too, with special reference to their action in regard to the case of Bishop Onderdonk. We allude to the passage of the Canon against themselves, to the effect that such a thing as a sentence of *indefinite suspension* shall never again be inflicted upon a minister of the Church. To do this, to acknowledge the wrong, and yet withhold relief from the injured party, whose pitiable case demanded action against the further invasion of individual rights, affords additional evidence of the danger to be apprehended from what we must again designate as a burlesque on judicial proceedings of ecclesiastical bodies. The Church should not, by injudicious legislation, deprive individuals of civil rights, if she would have her tribunals unmolested by the civil arm. Neither ought she to expect that when she sees her faults and mends her legislation, but withholds mercy and justice from the subject of her acknowledged error, that she will continue to grow in favor with her Divine Head. And, if the Church would look lovely in the eyes of her children, she must do justly and love mercy; in short, she must follow the example of her Lord.

This Opinion, which was not published until September 29, 1859, throws much valuable light upon important points, some of which, after so many years of quiet submission, have come to be but little understood, and some, though not the least of which, have never received the slightest public attention—the case having never been tried. The Opinion concludes with these words :

“On the whole, I am satisfied that the sentence in question has become inoperative—has long since performed its office. That the construction which has been given to that sentence, as imposing and continuing disabilities upon the Bishop, was erroneous. That by virtue of the Canon of 1844, a penalty and punishment not before authorized, could not be imposed for offences or acts prior to that year. That the contract made by this Diocese with the Bishop, was binding, and was not affected or rendered invalid by the suspension; and that the Bishop, in proceeding to enforce his rights, would be performing a duty, and would be doing the Church a real service by settling a matter now held in doubt and uncertainty.”

After its submission to such men as Horace Binney, Esq., of Philadelphia, Chief Justice Jones, of this city, Judge Redfield, of Vermont, and others no less distinguished, the Opinion was returned by each and all of them with unqualified approval and assurance that the Bishop's application to the Court for relief, by virtue of a writ of mandamus, could not fail to accomplish the end in view. In laying the Opinion before the public, the editor of *The Churchman* says :

“We now present the readers of *The Churchman* with an interesting legal document, which, though written some years since, has never before seen the light. There need, however, be no apology offered for exhuming this paper. Its marked ability and striking application to the present position of our aged Diocesan, as well as the vital interests of the points discussed, to the State, the Church, and to every individual, have secured for it a large share of our columns, and will warrant an attentive and wide-spread perusal.

“It would be unkind in us not to say that Bishop Onderdonk has no knowledge whatever of our intention to publish anything concerning this matter. Indeed, we risk little in saying that he is unapprised of the fact that the papers in relation to the proposed case have been preserved, and are now in our possession, nor do we hesitate to express the conviction, that if he had been consulted about their publication, his natural instincts would have prompted the sturdiest resistance to the same.

“After saying thus much, and printing the reply of the Bishop to his disinterested friend (who projected the movement and submitted the case to him, all prepared at his own risk and cost), we cannot but hope that the grounds of his refusal to accept the proffered aid, and make the contemplated application to the Supreme Court, will not only elevate him in public estimation, but will serve to check in some degree those unfavorable ebullitions of feeling now beginning to manifest themselves in the public prints, touching the restoration of this afflicted prelate to the exercise of his official duties in the Diocese with which he stands connected, and from which it is impossible for him to separate himself without the commission of an act involving official suicide, and fraught with danger to the Church.

The restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, however worthy he may be considered, is by no means a personal matter. The interests of the Diocese are paramount to every other consideration, and this view is well stated in the following reply to the Bishop's letter; and, so far as its *Division* is concerned, the Diocese is bound hand and foot. It cannot be divided without his consent; and this he cannot give, in its present anomalous position.

"But for the publication of what has been so carefully prepared and designed for trial before a civil court, it would not appear, as it should, what strong assurances the Bishop has had, and what weighty reasons for believing that the proposed application for relief would be successful; and yet, after prayerful consideration, to see it all overruled by him in a spirit of self-sacrificing submission and love of peace—such a state of things, we say, is quite enough to inspire us with just such generous impulses and feelings which seem to have moved the hearts of those who participated in the present (1859) benevolent enterprise of Restoration. Bearing this in mind, the reader will the better appreciate the following letter from the Bishop, declining, as above stated, to be made a party to the prosecution."

LETTER FROM BISHOP ONDERDONK.

FRANKLIN-STREET, September 15, 1853.

My Dear Mr. —: As the time seems to have arrived when it is proper for me to say whether I am willing to become an appellant to a civil tribunal against the Ecclesiastical sentence under which I have so long suffered, I feel compelled, after long, deep, and serious reflection—such as the solemnity of the case required, and such, I humbly hope, as behooves a Christian who recognizes his dependence upon a Higher Power, and the necessity of His inspiration and guidance—to inform you that I cannot, at present, regard such an appeal as my duty. You who know exactly how the case has stood between us, will not, I am sure, impute blame to me for my delay in doing so, nor consider my decision as disappointing any expectation which I have justified you in forming.

Before, however, proceeding to state the reasons for this conclusion, I must indulge the expression of my deep and grateful sensibility to the disinterested and generous friendship and kindness toward me which the subject has elicited from you. For this I shall ever be thankful. It strengthens the claim you have long had to my respect and affection. That God may bless you for it, will always be, as it has been, my earnest prayer.

Some things are duties under all circumstances, because they are, in themselves, morally binding. Some, not having this abstract moral character, become duties only under certain circumstances. Under others, they are either indifferent, or, perhaps, wrong. The Bible, the only genuine code of morals, is to furnish our rule of judgment in the matter.

It does not appear from that sacred volume, that going to law, even in a righteous cause, is a duty in itself. Indeed, as far as my memory serves, the only direct reference to that procedure, in the counsels of the New Testament, are rather adverse to it. (See 1 Corinthians, vi. 1-7.)

When I add that the Bible is full of strong commendation and requirement of *long-suffering* and *non-resistance*, as Christian duties, I by no means wish to be considered as supposing that it condemns resisting and seeking redress as always wrong. They may often be right, and sometimes a duty. Clearly, however, it is also true that the path of duty sometimes lies in the direction indicated by St. Paul, when he says, "Why do ye not rather take wrong."

Going to law, even to remove an unquestionable wrong, or gain an unquestionable right, is or is not a duty, according to the circumstances of the case. The circumstances of the present case are such, that after the deepest and most anxious consideration of them—deeper and more anxious because of my thorough conviction that the end proposed is an entirely righteous one—I cannot see that I ought to accede to your very kind and disinterested proposal.

A preliminary difficulty—one, however, that would, of itself, be by no means powerful—is the irresistible repugnance I have always felt to clerical strifes about salary, and to bringing ecclesiastical matters before the civil courts. I can readily conceive, however, that there may be occasions requiring, and circumstances justifying such things.

In a case so entirely new to me, and on which I feel myself incompetent to form an intelligent opinion by my own unaided judgment, I naturally think of those learned in the law, enlightened and experienced in judicial matters, and well versed in ecclesiastical matters, who, for years, have favored me with their counsels, sympathy, and co-operation in things relating to the Church. Gratefully acknowledging the kind and efficient interest which my valued friend has taken in the case, and the favorable opinion of making the appeal which he has expressed, I find, nevertheless, that my friends have very generally entertained views *unfavorable* to it. This cannot but have weight with me.

Among such of the clergy as have touched upon the subject, the most that I have found has been cold *acquiescence*, amounting, in one or two cases, to as cold *approval*; rather, however, as a desperate measure, than one in itself desirable.

And this opens a view of the case to which few circumstances could induce me to refer, except the just claim which you, my valued friend, have upon me for a frank and ingenuous avowal of the reasons which compel me to decline the important and solemn step on which your heart has been so long and so kindly set.

I cannot shut out the obvious consideration, that the contemplated appeal would involve me in a kind of action, or rather, perhaps, class of actions, and in thoughts, cares, and states of mind, entirely foreign from my natural inclinations and cherished habits; and which I cannot contemplate without great repugnance. Nor is it to be doubted that the resulting excitements in the Church and the community, would be often very vexatious and mortifying. In the disquietude, perhaps depression of mind, very likely to be the consequence, I trust I may be pardoned for saying that I should greatly need the solace and support of a refuge in the earnest and affectionate sympathy of my clerical brethren around me. It may be a weakness; but so it is, that, shut out as I am, from the ordinary resources of society, and of the chosen and beloved occupations of the Holy Ministry, I feel more and more my dependence on those best of human consolations and supports, which flow from the experience of the intelligent, generous, and proved sympathy of those about us whom we esteem and love. *I do not now see reasonable ground of confidence that I should be thus sustained and encouraged.* This painful remark has not reference simply to the point now in hand. It is prompted also by experience of a wider range—there being, however, cases of exception for which I feel warmly and affectionately thankful.

Under all the circumstances of the case, I confess I feel an irrepressible repugnance to the idea of being drawn before the public in a new, and, to me, particularly distasteful way.

It hurts me much, my dear friend, to fear that this decision will greatly disappoint you; but I trust you know me too well to allow it to be also displeasing. Few subjects have ever occupied my mind more seriously and solicitously; and my conclusion has been reached honestly, sincerely, and in the fear of God.

It would be unjust in itself, as well as inconsistent with the promptings of my heart, to close without expressing my respectful and grateful sense of the ability and excellence of the Legal Opinion of Mr. ———, with the perusal of which you favored me.

Commending you to God's blessing, and asking your prayers that I may be sustained and guided by His grace in the multitude of the difficulties and trials which lie in my path, and that He will overrule them all to His glory, and my spiritual good,

I am, my dear Mr. ———,

Affectionately and truly yours,

BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK.

REPLY.

NEW-YORK, October 4, 1853.

TO THE RIGHT REV. BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK:

Dear Sir—The severe and dangerous sickness of several members of my family has prevented an earlier response to your communication of the 15th of September last.

I have perused the document with deep interest, and have seriously pondered the decision it announced, fortified as it is with the highest authority known to the Church.

Viewed as a merely personal matter, your resolution to take wrong, and suffer yourself to be injured, is worthy the character of the Bishop of the most important Diocese in the New World, and must challenge the admiration of every Christian. So far as the subject is a private concern between the Bishop and his persecutors, it seems to be directly within the scope of the Apostle's admonition, which you so aptly quote.

Your able support of the position has, in some degree, modified my previous view of the case. But I have ever looked at the question from a higher and more commanding stand-point, one from which the individual sufferer appeared as the victim

of a high-handed injustice, inflicted in the name of the Church, and originating in a conspiracy which seemed utterly reckless of the consequences to the cause of Christ and His Church, if it could but accomplish the destruction of the object of its hate.

I saw that it was the Church which was suffering, when her institutions were made the instruments of wrong-doing. By the usurpation and injustice which decreed the indefinite suspension of our Bishop, the subject is taken out of St. Paul's category, and placed on a higher ground than even the injunction of an Apostle—the establishment of equity and justice. The appeal to our civil tribunals for the vindication of rights which had been set at naught in the name of the Church, ought not to be considered as going to law before "unbelievers," which seems to have been a principal objection in the mind of the Apostle. Besides, our judges, though far from being perfect, are doubtless superior to those before whom the primitive brethren preferred their complaints.

Notwithstanding the importance I attach to the establishment, through the civil courts of our country, of the principles contended for in the legal document submitted to your inspection, still I feel bound to abide by the decision you give, which seems to have been made up with care and in a Christian spirit; yet the welfare of the Church was assailed in overwhelming the rights of its Bishop, and however much the individual holding the office for the time being might regret an appeal to the civil tribunals, and be willing to suffer wrong, I still believe that, *in his representative character as Bishop, he should defend the rights entrusted to his care in the only way that the defence could be made.* In the present case, such a proceeding would be important to the well-being of the Church; but a time may arrive, and circumstances concur, when not only the unity, but also the very existence of the Church, might depend on the decision of a point like that proposed for settlement by the court.

An intelligent community could easily be made to appreciate the difference between a merely personal matter, and the stern requirements of official duty. The evil example would be rebuked, and a vicious precedent nullified. And, even if an adverse decision should be rendered, of which I have not the least fear, the attempt to vindicate undoubted rights could not but have a salutary influence, while it would not be the first righteous cause that failed to receive a verdict in its favor.

That you may have a continuance of that strength of mind and reliance on God, that have so well sustained you thus far in your affliction, is my earnest prayer. Ever cherishing as I have the warmest friendship for you, from the day of my Confirmation at your hands to the present hour,

I remain, Right Rev. Sir,
Your obedient servant,

— — —

Last Movement

FOR THE

RESTORATION OF BISHOP ONDERDONK.

PRELIMINARY MEASURES.

THE decease of Bishop Onderdonk has invested with melancholy and peculiar interest the last effort for the removal of his sentence. It will not be out of place, therefore, to record the proceedings of those who had the matter in hand, and thus preserve the facts connected with their laudable but unsuccessful efforts to remove a dark spot from the page of American Ecclesiastical History.

At the meeting of the Board of Missions, in October, 1858, the subject of the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk was, by God's good Spirit, suggested to the mind of the Rev. Dr. Hawks, who, upon inquiry, became satisfied that so desirable an end was possible. He thereupon caused certain proposals to be made to the Bishop, respecting the preparation of a Memorial to the House of Bishops. This was accomplished a few months afterwards, through the agency of the Bishop's friends, Dr. Hawks, having, as he said in the Diocesan Convention, neither seen the Bishop nor had any communication with him during the fourteen years of his suspension, save once, and then casually. At the request of Bishop Onderdonk, Dr. Hawks made a sketch of what he considered an appropriate Memorial, which was substantially approved by the Bishop. This rough draft was afterwards read by Dr. Hawks to several clerical brethren, and also to the Right Rev. Dr. Potter, the then Provisional Bishop, when, with one exception, all expressed themselves gratified with the state of mind exhibited by the tone of the document. Bishop Onderdonk then prepared a Memorial to the House of Bishops (based upon the original sketch), which is given on the following page.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S MEMORIAL.

To the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America :

Brethren.:—Fourteen years have elapsed since, by the Canonical action of an Ecclesiastical Court of Bishops, I was suspended from the office of a Bishop and from all the functions of the Sacred Ministry. To that sentence I have quietly submitted, and now present myself before you, respectfully aggrieved as I felt at the time, by a sentence which I deem it right, before God and man, frankly and truly to lay before you the present state of my feelings, and the grounds on which I ask the removal of the penalties under which I suffer.

In the excitement of feeling consequent on my trial and sentence, it was natural that much should be said, on both sides, that in the more dispassionate moments of calm Christian judgment would afterwards be regretted and disclaimed. You will, however, brethren, permit me to say that deeply aggrieved as I felt at the time, by a sentence which I thought to be unduly severe, I have yet no recollection of having endeavored to justify my own view by attributing to my brethren unworthy motives. If the feelings of any of them have been hurt by the supposition that I had in this way done them injustice, I sincerely regret it, and hope that I may be pardoned for any expressions which may have been supposed to bear such a construction. I censure them not for upholding, as they believed, the honor of the Church, by the administration of discipline when they conscientiously thought it was deserved. I should very little deserve, brethren, what I solicit at your hands, if I were ready at once to acknowledge all the crimes which may have been imputed to me by enemies, and to profess penitence for that of which I am really not guilty. I cannot consent to purchase even restoration at the price of falsehood and hypocrisy.

And yet, I presume not to say that I am entirely faultless, and have deserved no censure. I am not exempt from human infirmity, and, in the calmer reflections to which the lapse of time has contributed, I acknowledge that I cannot but believe parts of my conduct to have betrayed indiscretion, and that my demeanor must, in some instances, have been calculated to produce impressions injurious alike to the Church and myself, however such effect may have been unintended and unperceived on my part. I say that I cannot but believe this, because some of my fellow-Christians, and, among them, some of yourselves, brethren, felt bound to this extent to condemn me. I beg you, however, to believe me, when I most solemnly declare that, in this matter, I was not the slave of deliberate impurity of intention.

But be my offences small or great, to whatever extent, brethren, I have brought reproach on the cause of our Master, or given just offence to any of my fellow-Christians, even without a purposed intention of wickedness, I am, without reference to your action on this request, heartily sorry, and desire to humble myself in penitence before God and man. I can say truly, and I thank God for it, as I now do, without any reference to man or his doings, that I have long endeavored to live in a state of habitual repentance for all my sins, known and unknown, and have daily sought forgiveness for them, from the mercy of God, for the sake of His Son Jesus Christ.

I have borne the sentence imposed on me with bitter anguish, I confess, and a painful sense of humiliation, but without murmuring or complaint, and with constant and earnest prayer for the pardon of all my sins,

and grace for amendment. Of the effect of this repentance on the hidden man of the heart, there is but one Judge. Of its effects on my outward life, there are those who can speak with more propriety than myself. And herein I am bold to refer you not only to those who have been generally considered as my friends, but to those also of a different class. Those who have known me will, I humbly trust, bear me witness, that ever since the sentence has been imposed, my life has been quiet, my doings unobtrusive, and my conduct, as a member of Christ's Church, not liable to reproach.

I now beg, Christian brethren, the mercy of a removal of my sentence. So far as the honor of the Church is involved, I have hoped that all would see it had been amply vindicated by fourteen years of punishment, borne in silence and seclusion, and that Christians, knowing the object of ecclesiastical punishment to be reformatory and not vindictive, would willingly see the Church, after vindicating her purity, exercise her blessed privilege of showing mercy by restoring a brother whom she had once felt obliged to blame and rebuke, rejoicing more over his happy return than over the "ninety and nine which went not astray." Brethren, if any man be overtaken in a fault, ye which are spiritual, restore such an one in the spirit of meekness; considering thyself, lest thou also be tempted.

I need not say how deeply my heart is interested in the object of this application—what a painful and oppressive burden would be removed from it, and with what joy and gladness it would be filled, if, before the short remainder of my life has passed, I would be again allowed the happiness which, for so many years was imparted, of exercising the functions of the Holy Ministry. Look, brethren, into your hearts; consider their loves of the duties of our office, and then judge ye.

Of the consequences of my restoration, should you grant it, I have little to say. You would very justly despise me if, for the sake of enforcing this, my application, I should, on this subject, volunteer promises concerning my action in the Diocese of New-York. All I can say is, however, that age and suffering have done their work on me, and that I hope I am humble enough, and know that I am sincere enough in my love of the Church of Christ, never wantonly, by any act of mine, to disturb its harmony or obstruct its progress. Beyond this I can say nothing without seeming to seek clemency by gratuitous offers, disrespectful towards you and unworthy of myself.

My application, brethren, is now before you. May God, for Christ's sake, dispose you to view it favorably. Believe me, that I but express the sentiment of my daily prayer for my brethren in the Episcopate, when I conclude with the Apostle's words: "Mercy unto you, and peace, and love be multiplied."

In the spirit, I humbly hope, of this, my heart's desire and prayer to God, I subscribe myself your faithful brother in Christ,

BENJAMIN T. ONDERDONK.

This Memorial was shown by Dr. Hawks to Dr. Tyng, who expressed his willingness to sign a petition advocating the prayer of the Memorialist, provided that Bishop Onderdonk, although still retaining jurisdiction, would commit the *administrative* portion of his Episcopal duties to Bishop Potter.

The next day (September 6th, 1859), Dr. Tyng received a note inviting him to the house of Bishop Onderdonk, at which he was "astonished," as he had never been inside the Bishop's house, and had not seen him but

twice since he had been in the Diocese. An interview, however, was accordingly had between the Bishop and Drs. Hawks and Tyng, in the presence of Dr. Eigenbrodt, when Bishop Onderdonk agreed to sign the following letter, to be sent to Bishop Potter, in the event of favorable action by the Bishops on the preceding Memorial:

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S LETTER TO BISHOP POTTER.

NEW-YORK, Oct. —, 1859.

Right Rev. and Dear Sir:—The House of Bishops having responded favorably to my prayer for a remission of my sentence of suspension, their action places me in the position of Diocesan, and the third Canon of 1850 changes your relation from that of *Provisional* to *Assistant* Bishop. It hence becomes my duty, under Canon VI. of 1832, to "assign" (such is the language of the law) to you, as Assistant Bishop, the Episcopal duties and exercise of Episcopal authority, which I desire at your hands.

I therefore lose no time, my dear brother, in assigning to you—subject to such regulations as may be made on mutual conference between ourselves—the entire possession of the *administrative* portion of Episcopal duty in the Diocese, to act precisely as you have been acting. Your faithfulness and zeal I know full well, and I have entire confidence in your ability and disposition to do wisely and well in the general administration of the Diocese; and I am thankful that, in my old age, I have such a friend and colleague as yourself on whom to lean. In case of doubt or special importance I know it will be your own desire to have the aid of such counsel, as upon a joint consultation, I may be able to give; and I have only to say that I shall be ever ready to give such services as I can in counsel, and in every way to co-operate with you most heartily in endeavoring to promote the peace, and advance the prosperity of the Diocese.

At my advanced age, the heavier duties of the Episcopate must devolve on you, and my performance of Episcopal acts must, of necessity, be less frequent than yours. Hence, I authorize you, under the Canon—subject as before stated—to retain the entire general administration of the Diocesan affairs in the regular routine, including the exercise of Episcopal Canonical consent—when such consent may be required; on my part, cheerfully agreeing to confirm and ratify such consent when thus exercised by you, it being my heartfelt desire and determination that, in no case, shall there ever be any difference or collision, or aught but harmony between us in any Church matter or question. For myself, I propose only the performance of such Episcopal duties as on our mutual conference may be deemed expedient.

I am, dear Bishop, very truly and affectionately, your brother in Christ,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK,
Bishop of the Diocese of New-York.

Right Rev. HORATIO POTTER, D. D., LL.D.,
Assistant Bishop of the Diocese of New-York.

This being entirely satisfactory, the petition was then signed by Drs. Hawks, Tyng, Cutler, and many others, when it was also presented to the Rev. Dr. Anthon, who affixed his signature thereto on the 9th of September.

It was then agreed that Dr. Hawks, Tyng and Anthon, should each call ten laymen together as a Committee of Consultation.

Drs. Hawks and Tyng were, in the meantime, appointed to call on Bishop Potter, and lay before him the draft of the letter proposed to be sent to him by Bishop Onderdonk, and confer with him fully on the subject of restoration. Dr. Anthon soon afterwards withdrew his name from the petition, asserting as his reason that "the matter, in its present shape, did not provide fully and effectually against the resumption of Bishop Onderdonk's jurisdiction."* The Committee of Consultation also disagreed, and Bishop Potter, as appears from the following letter, which, at his request, was read by Dr. Tyng before the Diocesan Convention, declined having anything to do with what, to him, most strangely, seemed to partake of the nature of a "private bargain."

BISHOP POTTER'S LETTER TO DR. TYNG.

NEW-YORK, 33 West 24th-street, *Sept. 23.*

MY DEAR DR. TYNG:—When you and Dr. Hawks, and Dr. Eigenbrodt, called on me last Monday, to state what had occurred in relation to a movement to procure the remission of the sentence of Bishop Onderdonk, and exhibited to me the Bishop's Memorial to the House of Bishops, and his letter, ante-dated, to me, you desired, apparently, to obtain my formal assent to what seemed to be in the nature of a private compact. As this matter had been initiated and thus far conducted without consulting me, and the particulars were then so new to me, had been so entirely private, as far as I was concerned, you may well suppose I was unprepared with an answer.

On reflection, my judgment is clear. I have duties in the House of Bishops where this question must go, which should not be complicated by previous arrangements of any kind, and certainly not for my own benefit; besides, I can never consent to prejudge an official question, and bind myself to a private contract on a matter of public duty.

I confess that much of this transaction seems to me to be in the nature of a private bargain. As such I can have nothing to do with it. It is contrary to the whole scope of our ecclesiastical system, is irregular and uncanonical. The position in which that bargain seeks to place me, is unknown to the Law of the Church, is indefinite, is full of perplexity, and must inevitably lead to confusion and wrangling. Let the Church do simply what is right and fitting for herself, without regard to me. Let my relations with the Diocese be the result of the free and impartial action of the authorities of the Church. If it be desired to restore Bishop Onderdonk to his jurisdiction, let it be done, and let me take the place of an Assistant in the ordinary sense, the full power and responsibilities of the administration and public offices remaining in the hands of the restored

* Statement read by the Rev. Dr. Anthon, at the Diocesan Convention. The following "note" appeared in the *New-York Times*:

To the Editor of the NEW-YORK TIMES:

NEW-YORK, Thursday, *Sept. 22, 1859.*

Will you permit me to state, through your columns, that, being satisfied, upon further reflection, that the peace and advancement of the Diocese require the resignation of Bishop ONDERDONK's jurisdiction over it, previous to the removal of his suspension, I have withdrawn my name from the petition in circulation.

Respectfully yours,

HENRY ANTHON.

Bishop. Such an arrangement would be clear. No other restoration to jurisdiction can be.

Most faithfully yours,

HORATIO POTTER.

To the REV. DR. TYNG.

It will be borne in mind that the Memorial asked for unconditional restoration at the hands of the Bishops of the Church. This alone was what Bishop Onderdonk desired. This, and nothing short of this, he felt was due to himself, to his Diocese, and to the Church at large. Bishop Potter would thus have become the Assistant Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, and it would then have been the duty of the Diocesan to "assign" to the Assistant, in accordance with the Canon, such portion of Episcopal duty as he might have thought proper, still, however, retaining jurisdiction. The proposed letter to Bishop Potter contained such assignment, and for the satisfaction of some, it was prepared in advance, and shown to Bishop Potter for the purpose of assuring him that no "difference or collision" could ever occur in connection with the arrangement. Little was it expected that a letter thus Canonically drawn up would have been stigmatized and condemned as a "private bargain."

Bishop Potter having thus set himself against the proposed movement for restoration, the enemies of Bishop Onderdonk, encouraged thereby, exerted themselves to the utmost to overthrow the good work, and so far succeeded as to cause the Bishop to withdraw his Memorial, as will appear from the letters which follow :

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S FIRST LETTER TO THE REV. DRS. HAWKS,
TYNG, AND EIGENBRODT.

NEW-YORK, September 25, 1859.

TO THE REV. FRANCIS L. HAWKS, D. D., LL.D., THE REV. STEPHEN H.
TYNG, D. D., AND THE REV. WILLIAM E. EIGENBRODT, D. D.

Rev. and Dear Brethren :—In reference to the cordial and active interest you have been kind enough to take in the now much discussed subject of my restoration, I beg to address you this letter.

It is a matter of most grateful recollection to me that the taking of that interest, and incipient action thereon, were without any prompting or suggestion, or even a knowledge of the fact on my part, but the result of your own solemn and deliberate convictions of what was right. I desire also to express my sensibility to the delicate and respectful manner in which, when the course of things rendered communication and conference with me proper and necessary, these were conducted by you. It was the taking of sweet counsel together by brethren, on matters justly regarded by each and all of us as invested with much sacredness, and deep and solemn responsibility. I thank you for the truly Christian manner in which, throughout the whole, you recognized my peculiar share of that responsibility, and the respect you were therefore kind enough to pay to my judgment and feelings. The natural result was, that the issues thus attained became fully and entirely my own acts.

It has been to me a source of holy satisfaction and gratitude, to see how

deeply you were moved by conviction of Christian duty, and a desire to promote the good of the Church, and serve the cause of its peace and harmony; and I humbly trust that therein you have found in me a cordial sympathizer and co-worker.

We have all seen enough of the world to know, that in practically applying the principles and affection of love, peace, harmony, and good order, and of attachment to truth and right, especially in sacred matters, unlooked for changes, and developments of circumstances, require correspondent changes of purpose—and this in proportion to conscientious convictions of the rectitude, solemnity, and importance of the object desired. I beg to say, therefore, brethren, that I commit to your discretion, in full confidence, the subject of the propriety, under existing circumstances, of arresting all proceedings in the matter in hand. Should you think this the proper course, I will cheerfully adopt the decision as my own also, and respectfully request the return of such papers of mine as may be in the possession of Dr. Hawks.

Humbly commending you to the blessings of God's providence and grace, I am,

Rev. and dear brethren,
Truly and affectionately yours,
In the love of Christ and His Church,
BENJ. T. ONDERDONK.

REPLY TO THE ABOVE.

NEW-YORK, September 25, 1859.

Right Rev. and Dear Sir :—We have to acknowledge the reception of your private and friendly note of this morning. When we assumed the position which we have occupied in relation to your application for a remission of the sentence of suspension imposed upon you, we did it with our own perfect satisfaction with the expression of your mind and feelings, in your Memorial to the House of Bishops, and also with the proposed arrangements for securing peace and harmony in the administration of the Diocese, in the event of a favorable reply to the prayer of the Memorial; and we have, therefore, carefully, with much pleasure, contributed our efforts to the attainment of the result desired. On these points our individual minds remain unchanged. In those arrangements which had been proposed by you for the harmonious administration of the Diocese, we hoped to have found an universal concurrence and satisfaction. This, in the prosecution of our efforts, we regret to say, we have failed to obtain; and we have encountered difficulties which, in the good providence of God, we hope the further lapse of time will completely overcome. And though our minds remain unchanged in all the points previously referred to, we regret to say that we are constrained to adopt the suggestion of your note, "committed to our discretion," viz.: "the propriety, under existing circumstances, of arresting all proceedings in the matter in hand;" and accordingly comply with your request for "the return of such papers of yours as may be in the hands of Dr. Hawks," which we herewith transmit.

We are, with most affectionate respect,

Your friends, and brethren in the Ministry,

STEPHEN H. TYNG,
FRANCIS L. HAWKS,
WILLIAM E. EIGENBRODT.

Right Rev. B. T. ONDERDONK.

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S SECOND LETTER TO THE REV. DRS. HAWKS,
TYNG, AND EIGENBRODT.NEW-YORK, *September 26th*, 1859.

Rev. and Dear Brethren:—I thank you for your note in reply to mine of this morning, and for the renewed expression of your kind feelings. The peace of the Diocese is an object near to all our hearts. In reference to the bearing on this, of the question of arresting, under present circumstances, all proceedings connected with the Memorial from me to the Bishops of the Church: perceiving by your note that you are of opinion that this course would be judicious, I hereby, according to my promise, acquiesce therein, and have determined to act accordingly. Thanking you for the return, agreeably to my request, of my papers on that subject, which have been in the possession of Dr. Hawks, I am,

Very truly and affectionately yours,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK.

REV. STEPHEN H. TYNG, D. D.,
REV. FRANCIS L. HAWKS D. D., LL.D.
REV. WILLIAM E. EIGENBRODT, D. D.

The object dear to the hearts of so many Churchmen was thus apparently abandoned. But God raised up other instruments to carry forward the work. The Rev. Dr. Francis Vinton, on hearing that the Bishop had decided to withdraw his Memorial, called upon him to ascertain the truth of the assertion. The following letter from the venerable Prelate contains his answer:

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S FIRST LETTER TO THE REV. DR. VINTON.

WEST 27TH-ST., *September 27th*, 1859.

MY DEAR DR. VINTON:—I write this in reply to your question put to me this morning. The conversation in which that question arose, grew out of your having understood that I had now determined not to send to the Bishops assembled at the approaching General Convention, a Memorial praying for the removal of my suspension, which I had prepared and placed in the hands of a clerical brother for delivery to the Bishops. It was stated to me, a few days ago, by this brother and others who had long coöperated with him in kind and earnest spontaneous labor in behalf of the object of that Memorial, that—although their views of the subject were precisely what they had been, and they believed and hoped that the object would be accomplished—yet they thought that just now, and under existing circumstances, it would be better to arrest the prosecution of that object, and that the proposed Memorial should be returned to me. To this I assented, in consideration of their having been so long engaged in the matter, with opportunities far greater than I could have, of forming an intelligible opinion in the premises. Hence the fact of their proceedings being arrested, and of the Memorial, a copy of which I herewith, at your request, send to you, being again in my possession. I also send a copy of each of my letters to these brethren on this subject, of their reply to me, and of my answer to the latter. In immediate reply to your question, I beg, dear Doctor, to say, that notwithstanding this state of things, I shall feel myself at full liberty, and regard it as a duty, cheerfully and gratefully to forward a Memorial to the Bishops for a termination of my sus-

pension, as soon as I have satisfactory evidence of such being the kind wish of my brethren of the Diocese, to an extent entitling it to compliance on my part.

I am, dear Doctor, with prayers for God's spiritual and temporal blessings upon you,

Yours, truly and affectionately,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK,

REV. FRANCIS VINTON, D. D.

P. S.—Much having been said and published respecting a note* proposed by me to be sent to the Provisional Bishop of this Diocese, in the event of the Memorial being laid before the Bishop, and favorably acted on, I enclose a copy of it, and am prepared to make further explanations respecting it, if desired.

THE MOVEMENT AT MEETING OF THE DIOCESAN CONVENTION OF 1859.

THE New-York Diocesan Convention met the day after the above letter was written, when the Rev. Dr. Vinton introduced the subject of the Bishop's restoration. He briefly reviewed the Canons bearing on the case of the Bishop, and showed by enactments subsequent to the trial, that no mortal could be placed in the painful position occupied by the Bishop of New-York. He also argued that to move in this matter was no prejudice to the Provisional Bishop, since he was elected under a Canon which expressly provided that he should become the Assistant in case of the restoration of the Principal, who, when restored, would assign to the Assistant such duties as he might be desired to perform.

As long as a year ago, when on a sick bed, Dr. Vinton heard of the first beginning of this movement, and he believed that nothing less than the Spirit of God moved the heart of that noble brother (Dr. Hawks), who had taken the matter in hand, and who, at the meeting of the Board of Missions, in October, 1858, found reason to believe that the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk was possible. Dr. Vinton then read Bishop Onderdonk's Memorial and the proposed letter to Bishop Potter,† assigning to him the *administrative* portion of Episcopal duty. After which the Doctor said, with reference to the reason for the withdrawal of the papers, "It was enough to say that opposition had been made in high quarters, and with such earnestness and deep feeling as manifested in communications, in newspapers, and representations made by clergymen and laymen, that the brethren had become disheartened at the misrepresentation and clamor." He then assured the Convention that it would be perfectly safe to relieve the Bishop from a sentence which he—and now he *alone* of all mankind—could ever suffer. He had inquired Bishop Onderdonk's age, for he was now an old man, and becoming infirm, and his heart was moved within

* The letter referred to will be found on page 129.

† *Idem*.

him when he found that, if the present occasion be suffered to slip by unused, he would, before the arrival of another General Convention, have reached the full ordinary limit of human life. Under these circumstances, as a Churchman, as a Christian, he felt that he could not decline the task which he was now imperfectly discharging. All these considerations came rushing over him, and his decision was made, irrevocably made, that he would stand up before the Convention and tell them this—tell them calmly, and beg them to act without passion.

At the close of his speech, the Rev. Doctor offered the following resolution, which was seconded by the Rev. Thomas T. Guion :

“Resolved, That this Convention of the Diocese of New-York do hereby respectfully request the House of Bishops to remit and terminate the Judicial Sentence of Suspension, under which the Bishop of the Diocese of New-York is now suffering disability ; or to modify the same, so far as to designate a precise period of time, or other specific contingency, on the occurrence of which the sentence shall utterly cease, and be of no further force or effect.”

Samuel Freeman, M. D., then moved to lay the resolution on the table, but being earnestly requested to withdraw his motion, in order that some explanations might be made, he consented. The Rev. Drs. Hawks and Tyng then made statements of the part they had taken in the movement. Dr. Anthon also read a “statement” of his reasons for withdrawing his name from the Memorial.

After the reading of Bishop Potter’s letter (see p. 130) by the Rev. Dr. Tyng, the Bishop remarked that he had nothing to say upon the subject; he was willing to let the matter stand as it was. The brethren had made their explanations, and he thought the vote ought now to be taken upon the motion to lay the whole matter on the table.

The meeting then adjourned without vote, it being past ten o’clock P. M.

On Friday morning, September 30th, after some preliminary business, the vote was taken on the resolution to lay on the table, and resulted as follows :

	<i>Ayes.</i>	<i>Nays.</i>
Clergy.....	33	138
Laity.....	52	70
Total.....	85	208

So the motion to lay on the table was lost.

The Hon. Murray Hoffman then moved that the resolution offered by the Rev. Dr. Vinton, be amended by striking out all after the word “Resolved,” and inserting, so that it shall read as follows :

“Resolved, That the Remission of the Sentence of the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk would be acceptable to this Convention, on the condition that the restrictions upon the exercise of Episcopal powers and offices within this Diocese, set forth in his letter to the Right Rev. Bishop H. Potter, laid before this Convention, and a copy of which is hereto appended [p.

129], be annexed to the same; or such restrictions, relating to the exercise of such powers, not inconsistent with the terms in such letter, as the House of Bishops deem proper."

The Rev. William A. McVickar moved that the Hon. Murray Hoffman's proposed amendment be amended by striking out all after the word "Resolved," and inserting, so that it shall read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Right Rev. the Provisional Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, be requested to lay before the House of Bishops the papers upon the subject of the Restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, viz.: A Memorial to the House of Bishops from said Bishop, and an ante-dated letter from said Bishop, which have been read before this Convention, for such action thereon as the House of Bishops, in their wisdom, may deem best."

This amendment was rejected almost unanimously; and after some discussion as to the bearing of Judge Hoffman's amendment, the Rev. Dr. Vinton accepted it as a substitute for his own resolution.

The Hon. Samuel B. Ruggles, one of the four delegates to the General Convention, then moved that the resolution of the Hon. Murray Hoffman be amended by striking out all after the word "condition," and thereafter adding, so that it shall read as follows:

"*Resolved*, That the Remission of the Sentence of Bishop Onderdonk would be acceptable to this Convention, on condition that he deposit in the office of the Secretary of the House of Bishops, a full resignation of his jurisdiction as Bishop of New-York."

In offering this amendment, Mr. Ruggles expressly stated his object to be, to ascertain, by unmistakable evidence, the wish of the Diocese on this particular point, and to be able to state, on the best authority, whether the Diocese did, or did not, desire Bishop Onderdonk to retain jurisdiction.

Bishop POTTER (rising)—May I appeal to the gentleman to withdraw that amendment?

Mr. Ruggles then withdrew it; but hoped the Bishop would give his reasons.

Bishop POTTER—(visibly affected)—My reasons are very simple; I don't like to state them. I am continually hampered and restrained about things which I cannot rightly say, because of a consideration of what will be my duties in another place. I cannot suffer that this Convention, over which that person, of whom so much has been said, once presided, should send with me the favor which they ask to have conferred, accompanied by a request for his resignation. Do not stigmatize him by any expression of that kind. I confess to you, gentlemen, I have been restrained by friends from saying what I would have liked to say to you, and I am not going to say it now. I do feel a desire to say, first of all, that when I sent into the Committee that had called on me at the last moment, my objections to the arrangements which they were preparing, those objections were directed simply to the essential character of that arrangement. I did not wish to

put any veto on the Church in this Diocese if they desired to approach the House of Bishops. I simply wished to express my opinion that that measure was fraught with evil. I tell you that that is a mischievous movement to attempt to make. An arrangement based on that letter which was addressed to me, you will find hereafter to be a mischievous arrangement, disturbing the peace of this Diocese, and more embarrassing to me than any other thing you could do. Nothing do I care for myself. I wish to make no personal matter of an affair of this kind. Nothing for persons. Nothing for individual pride. Everything for right: everything for the Church, and nothing for the individual's self. I would rather, gentlemen, that you should restore that individual to jurisdiction untrammelled, and with no view of its being returned to me hereafter. I would rather you would not expose him to that continual sense of degradation than to place me in the situation which you contemplated in that letter. It gives me one place which you take from another. You send me to that venerable man, who has been suffering for fifteen years, to tell me to dole out his task. Can I look in his eyes and not be overcome? I am to go to him to consult with him; is there any doubt where the controlling influence is to come from? He is a venerable man; I, inferior both in age and station. You load me with the duties of a principal, and you embarrass me by making me a subordinate. You make two centres. And do you know the state of things in this Diocese? Do you know the state of feeling in this Diocese? One party would rally round one centre; another would rally round another. You would create a state of things in this Diocese worse than any you ever saw in the worst days of the conflicts in regard to the measures that have gone before us. I say again, I cannot pass in this place upon the great measure under consideration. That must go elsewhere. I dare say many of you may have observed that on the first day of this Convention I took no part in the morning Services. I wished to be alone. I wished to be with myself, and with Him who knows all hearts, and metes out justice and mercy. I wished, if possible, to find out my duty and to do it, and my spirit was bowed down within me at the thought that this man was to pass by another General Convention; that he was to be elevated to heaven by his friends, and cast down as from a rock, in humiliation, and overpowered by difficulties and disappointments. Every step of my way as I attempt to address myself to you, is hedged round with difficulties. I know how liable I am to be misconstrued, and I desire to say to those gentlemen who originated this movement that, without meaning to reflect on them, I feel grieved that they had not an opportunity of seeing me earlier. I am sorry that they thought it necessary to wait, when one day would carry them to me. I was sorry that they thought it necessary to wait till they got sixty names of my brethren to lay before me as a sort of mild persuasion, nay, something which to some would have looked like an attempt to intimidate. If I go to Richmond—and I would much rather stay away—they will find in me no enemy. I do not know what discussion will open. I do not know what will be the result of evidence and examination. May be I am to act there as a judge, and I cannot say beforehand how I shall decide a case that has not yet been presented to me; but I say I am conscious in myself that I have no feeling but what is fair. I care nothing for personal position, but I do care much for all those things which tend to harm, and for all those things which tend to efficiency of administration.

At the close of this speech, Governor King rose, and in a loud voice moved that the Convention adjourn *sine die*.

On taking the question, the motion was lost by sound. The President said it "seemed to him carried." Objection being made, and he being asked whether he decided it to be "carried," he said, "No, he did not so decide; but he *thought* it was carried." The constitutional call was made for a vote by orders; but the President decided the call too late, though made before he had formally announced the result of the vote. He declared that the question must be taken by ayes and nays. [The difference will be seen when it is recollected that in the one case three laymen have but one vote, in the other they have three voices.] Dr. Vinton quoted Article VI., of the Constitution, which provides that, "In all matters which shall come before the Convention, the clergy and laity shall deliberate in one body; and *in voting* the clergy shall vote by individuals and the laity by *congregations*." He insisted, therefore, on the clergy being taken first, yea and nay, and then the lay vote, only one delegate rising for each parish. The result was as follows:

	<i>Ayes.</i>	<i>Nays.</i>
Clergy.....	48	92
Congregations.....	59	59
	<hr/> 107	<hr/> 151

So the motion to adjourn *sine die* was lost.

After further discussion and motions to adjourn, the Hon. Samuel B. Ruggles renewed his amendment for resignation of jurisdiction. "The Bishop's case," said Mr. Ruggles, "concerns not only this particular Diocese, but the whole Church of the United States. The House of Bishops, representing such a wide-spread body, would necessarily be governed by its general interests—but would, nevertheless, listen with particular respect to any recommendation of the Diocese particularly affected. It was, therefore, eminently desirable, that any opinion entertained by this Diocese, and particularly on a point so fundamental as the *jurisdiction* of the Bishop, should be distinctly expressed. He, therefore, felt it his duty to press for a vote on this specific amendment, that the sense of the Diocese might be made distinctly manifest."

The question was then put and the amendment lost by an overwhelmingly large vote; thus decisively expressing the opinion that the Bishop, if restored, *should retain jurisdiction*.

Charles Davies, LL.D., moved that the Hon. Murray Hoffman's resolution be amended by striking out the words, "not inconsistent with the terms in such letter," which amendment was accepted by Judge Hoffman.

The Provisional Bishop then said that he thought much of the difficulty of the resolution was removed by the amendment just passed.

The vote was then taken on Judge Hoffman's resolution, by orders, and resulted as follows:

CLERGY.

AYES.

Rev. Mr. H. Adams,	Rev. Mr. Geer,	Rev. Dr. Payne,
" R. S. Adams,	" Gibson,	Rev. Mr. Pearson,
" Andrews,	" A. Guion,	" Pennell,
" Appleton,	" T. T. Guion,	" T. McC. Peters,
" P. Teller Babbit,	Rev. Dr. Hackley,	" Porter,
" Baker,	" Haight,	" Potter,
" Barrows,	Rev. Mr. J. L. Harrison,	" Pratt,
" Bates,	" Hart,	Rev. Dr. Price,
Rev. Dr. Beach,	" Haskins,	Rev. Mr. E. Roberts,
" Berrian,	" Hathaway,	" H. F. Roberts,
Rev. Mr. B. R. Betts,	Rev. Dr. Hawks,	Rev. Dr. J. J. Robertson,
" Boggs,	Rev. Mr. Hedges,	Rev. Mr. J. A. Robinson,
" C. W. Bolton,	Rev. Dr. Henry,	" Rodenstein,
" Brewer,	" Higbee,	Rev. Dr. Rudder,
Rev. Dr. Brown,	Rev. Mr. Hitchcock,	Rev. Mr. Scott,
Rev. Mr. J. H. H. Brown,	" Hollingsworth,	Rev. Dr. Schramm,
" Buel,	" Hopkins,	Rev. Mr. Selkirk,
Rev. Dr. Chauncey,	" Hopson,	" G. F. Seymour,
" Clap,	Rev. Dr. Houghton,	" Sill,
Rev. Mr. Clapp,	Rev. Mr. Howland,	" Sleight,
Rev. Mr. J. S. Clark,	" G. Huntington,	Rev. Mr. O. H. Smith,
" Cleveland,	" B. S. Huntington,	" J. S. Spencer,
" Coffey,	" Jessup,	" Spor,
" E. R. T. Cook,	" D. V. M. Johnson	" Stowell,
" I. F. Cox,	" E. M. Johnson,	" Stringfellow,
Rev. Dr. Creighton,	Rev. Dr. S. R. Johnson,	" Tiffany,
" Cutler,	" W. L. Johnson,	" Thomas,
Rev. Mr. H. M. Davis,	Rev. Mr. Judd,	" Traver,
" S. C. Davis,	Rev. Dr. Leonard,	Rev. Dr. Tucker,
" De Zeng,	" Lewis,	Rev. Mr. Tuttle,
" Dickinson,	Rev. Mr. Livingston,	" Twing,
" Diller,	" McIlwaine,	Rev. Dr. Tyng,
" Dix,	Rev. Dr. McVickar,	Rev. Mr. Upjohn,
" Draper,	Rev. Mr. W. A. McVickar,	Rev. Dr. Vinton,
" Drowne,	" Maybin,	Rev. Mr. W. Walsh,
" Duffie,	" Miller,	" J. M. Ward,
" Duncan,	" Millett,	" Warren,
" Early,	" W. H. Moore,	" Washbon,
" Eaton,	Rev. Dr. R. U. Morgan,	" Watson,
Rev. Dr. Eigenbrodt,	" W. F. Morgan,	" Weaver,
Rev. Mr. Elmendorf,	Rev. Mr. Mulcahey,	" Wellman,
" Embury,	" Neide,	" Wells,
" Fairbairn,	" G. H. Nichols,	" Weston,
" Fairbanks,	" Noll,	" Whiting,
" Farrington,	Rev. Dr. Ogilby,	" Widdener,
" J. B. Flagg,	Rev. Mr. Olssen,	" Jas. H. Williams,
" E. O. Flagg,	" J. A. Paddock,	" Wood,
" Fowler,	" W. F. Paddock,	" Wyatt,
" Gallaudet,	" Partridge,	" Young.

NOES.

Rev. Dr. Anthon,	Rev. Dr. Harris,	Rev. Mr. S. W. Sayres,
Rev. Mr. Anthon,	Rev. Mr. Huckel,	" J. C. Smith,
" Bostwick,	" W. R. Johnson,	Rev. Dr. Taylor,
" J. C. Brown,	Rev. Dr. Jones,	Rev. Mr. Thrall,
Rev. Dr. J. H. Coit,	Rev. Mr. Montgomery,	" White,
Rev. Mr. Eccleston,	" S. Reed,	" Wiley.
" Gribble,		

Ayes..... 147

Noes..... 19

ABSENTEES.

Right Rev. Dr. POTTER,	Rev. Mr. Frost,	Rev. Mr. Ransom,
Rev. Mr. Akerly,	“ Gessner,	“ Reese,
“ Franklin Babbitt,	Rev. Dr. Hobart,	“ Rodman,
“ Barton,	Rev. Mr. Hoffman,	“ R. C. Rodgers,
“ Beare,	“ Hoyt,	“ Rumney,
Rev. Dr. Bedell,	“ Hughes,	“ Scarborough,
Rev. Mr. Benedict,	“ P. P. Irving,	“ Scofield,
“ J. H. Betts,	Rev. Dr. T. Irving,	Rev. Dr. Seabury,
“ T. M. Bishop,	“ Jackson,	Rev. Mr. Shaw,
“ Black,	Rev. Mr. Kenney,	“ Shelton,
Rev. Dr. Canfield,	“ Labagh,	“ Shortt,
Rev. Mr. C. H. Canfield,	“ Lowell,	“ J. Howard Smith,
Rev. Dr. Carter,	“ Lowry,	Rev. Dr. Staunton,
Rev. Mr. Clarkson,	“ Lynd,	Rev. Mr. Synnot,
“ Coe,	“ Mallaby,	“ Temple,
Rev. Dr. T. W. Coit,	“ Maples,	“ Tracey,
“ S. Cooke,	“ J. W. Moore,	“ Treadway,
Rev. Mr. Cooper,	Rev. Dr. Morris,	“ Tripp,
“ Cornwall,	Rev. Mr. Francis Peck,	Rev. Dr. Turner,
“ Curtis,	“ W. L. Peck,	Rev. Mr. Vermilye,
“ Davis,	“ H. R. Peters,	“ Verren,
“ Dean,	“ Phelps,	“ Waite,
“ Edwards,	Rev. Dr. Pitkin,	“ Walker,
“ Ellsworth,	Rev. Mr. Pound,	“ G. H. Walsh,
“ W. G. French,	“ F. C. Putnam,	“ Waters.

TOTAL.

	<i>Ayes.</i>	<i>Noes.</i>	<i>Divided.</i>
Clergy.....	147	19	
Congregations.....	75	46	2
	222	65	2

The resolution, as adopted, read as follows :

“ *Resolved*, That the Remission of the Sentence of the Right Rev. Bishop Onderdonk would be acceptable to this Convention, on the condition that the restrictions upon the exercise of Episcopal powers and offices within this Diocese, set forth in his letter to the Right Rev. Bishop H. Potter, laid before this Convention, and a copy of which is hereto appended [see p. 129], be annexed to the same, or such restrictions relating to the exercise of such powers as the House of Bishops deem proper.”

The secretary was then directed to transmit to the House of Bishops, through the Deputies from this Diocese to the General Convention, the action had by the Convention on the subject.

Some attempts having been made to disparage the above vote, we may state that the whole number of clergy in the Diocese entitled to vote was 222; the number usually present at Convention, 195-98. The vote given at the recent Convention, is we believe, the largest since 1854, when the election of a Bishop called out 182 votes, there being then 232 entitled to vote. The 166 votes, therefore, cast at the last Convention came within nine or ten of being in proportion as large a vote as the exciting question of an election called out.

So with regard to the laity. Though 259 parishes were entitled to vote, only 158 were represented in 1858, and the votes cast in 1859 on the ques-

tion of Bishop Onderdonk's restoration—123 in all—is much larger than any since the election of Bishop Potter.

As an evidence of the state of feeling in New-York, respecting the Bishop's restoration, we quote the following from an able editorial in the New-York *Express* of October 1st, 1859 :

"The motives at work to produce the Bishop's restoration, we were persuaded at the start, were higher and nobler ones than any that could proceed from considerations of party, and hence we had no hesitation in expressing the hope that—speaking simply as men of the world, and as secular journalists—the movement should be successful. The hope is now realized. The movement is successful. The vote in the Convention yesterday is a virtual restoration of the Bishop—for though it is only a petition to the House of Bishops, at Richmond—it is a petition which gives unmistakable utterance to the now all but united voice of this Diocese, and it is not to be doubted for a moment, therefore, that these Right Reverend Fathers will take it upon themselves to turn a deaf ear to it. * * * * *

When they see on the same record the names of Vinton and Tyng, Howland and Beach, Higbee and Hawks, Hopkins and Lewis, Geer and Guion, the real state of the case it will be impossible to misinterpret or misapprehend. It may be taken for granted, therefore, that within a few days, the House of Bishops, as a logical result of the action of the Diocesan Convention, will grant the prayer of the petitioner, and thus restore their brother here to the office from which he has been suspended so long. Meanwhile, we again congratulate the Church upon the prospect that is thus presented of an early relief of the Diocese from the anomalous and unhappy position it has so long occupied, and the consequent restoration of that harmony and good feeling among its members, clerical and lay, which this 'vexed question' has at times so seriously disturbed."

THE DOINGS OF THE NEW-YORK DELEGATION.

SINCE the action of the Diocesan Convention had resulted so favorably, Bishop Onderdonk transmitted his Memorial to the Rev. Dr. Vinton, accompanied by the following letter :

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S SECOND LETTER TO THE REV. DR. VINTON.

NEW-YORK, *October 4th*, 1859.

MY DEAR DR. VINTON :—Agreeably to what I said in my last conversation, I now transmit the Memorial. Sickness and the press of kind friends have delayed my finishing it. I take the liberty of requesting my respected brethren, the Clerical Deputies from this Diocese, to take counsel together as to the best mode of bringing it to the notice of the Bishops.

When I had the pleasure of seeing you last, I did not recollect the fact that the proprietors of one of the papers of Richmond had advertised to receive subscriptions for the space of time occupied by the session of the Convention. I enclose \$3 for my subscription, and whatever other expenses may attend the transmission of printed documents of all sorts, ordered by either House of the Convention ; and also for discounts on the money, if there be any. If it should fall short, please let me know. If there be a surplus, please contribute it to any object for which offerings or collections may be made.

Commending you and your colleagues to the aid, direction, and blessing of God's heavenly grace, in the solemn and important matters before you, I am, dear Doctor,

Yours, truly and affectionately,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK.

REV. FRANCIS VINTON, D. D.

P. S.—*Wednesday, 5th.* Sickness has again intervened. The Memorial is an exact copy of the original, which I did not like to send, on account of its having become somewhat worn. Having begun to transcribe it, I did not wish to put it in the hands of a copyist, so as to present two different chirographs. It seemed to me more proper that the whole should be an autograph.

The New-York delegation were also entrusted with the following Memorial from the Church of the Annunciation, to be presented to the House of Bishops:

MEMORIAL OF THE CHURCH OF THE ANNUNCIATION, NEW-YORK.

To the House of Bishops of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, for the Year of our Lord 1859:

RIGHT REVEREND FATHERS:—The undersigned, the Rector, Wardens, and Vestrymen of the Church of the Annunciation, in the City of New-York, having understood that the Right Rev. B. T. Onderdonk, D. D., the Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, has addressed to your venerable body a Memorial praying to be relieved of the sentence of suspension, pronounced on him by a Court of Bishops in this city, in January, A. D., 1845, respectfully represent:

That the said Bishop B. T. Onderdonk, for nearly fifteen years, or ever since his suspension, has been a member of our Parish, and a constant attendant on Divine Service in our Church, both on week-days and Sundays. From this circumstance it has happened that some or other of our Parish have been, during the whole of this time, in habits of daily intercourse with our Bishop, and that we, the representatives of the Parish, have had opportunities not possessed by others, of observing his deportment, and we have no hesitation in bearing our unequivocal testimony to the purity and holiness of his life and conversation during the whole time of his connection with our Parish. In the sanctuary, we have been impressed and edified by his humble, reverential, and serious deportment. In his social intercourse, we have seen no levity in his manners, nor any evidence of impatience or discontent under his sufferings; nor have we ever heard from his lips the words of murmur or reproach. Degraded, in the Providence of God, to the rank of those over whom he once used to preside, he has set us a bright example of self-respect as a man, and of quiet and uncomplaining submission as a Christian; and, though debarred from the exercise of his office, he has uniformly displayed the gravity and dignity that are fitted to adorn it. The most of us bear this testimony from our personal knowledge of Bishop Onderdonk during the whole time of his suspension, the rest of us from personal knowledge during a large part of the time, and all of us in the belief that we have said no more than all the members of our Parish would be willing to confirm.

For about twelve years of his suspension, Bishop Onderdonk has resided at a distance of about two miles from his Parish church. Daily, and

often twice in the day, *i. e.*, whenever the church was opened twice a day, whatever might be the weather, the appointed hour of Service has always found him at the sanctuary, in the layman's place. He has been very seldom absent (and only, we believe, from imperative necessity), and never late when he has been present at all. The world, in the profoundness of its wisdom may explain this conduct without allowing it to be the fruits of faith in the ever blessed Gospel; but we should do injustice to your venerable body if we supposed that you could for an instant believe that the man who, without the stimulants of office, and under the severest discouragements, has, for the last fifteen years, *departed not from the temple, but served God day and night with prayers*, does not sincerely, fervently, and in the depths of his heart love the Great and Good Being whom he professes to serve.

In bearing this testimony to the deportment of Bishop Onderdonk, and uniting with their brethren to ask of you the termination of his sentence, the undersigned are desirous that their sentiments should not be misunderstood. At Bishop Onderdonk's advanced age they regard the removal of his sentence as a matter comparatively unimportant to himself and to his Diocese, and their wishes for its removal are prompted mainly by other considerations. They believe that Bishop Onderdonk does not now deserve the punishment which he suffers, and for this reason they think it *just* that he should be relieved from it. They remember that after the sentence was inflicted, the Church took the earliest possible opportunity to empower your venerable body to remove it, and to decree that no similar sentence should be pronounced in future. And as the Church has opened the way for the termination of the sentence, and as Bishop Onderdonk, in the opinion of the undersigned, does not deserve to suffer the pains which it imposes, they believe that the humane intentions of the Church will be fulfilled and her honor promoted by its unconditional remission. It is for this reason, chiefly, Right Rev. Fathers, that we unite with our brethren in requesting you to extend a favorable consideration to the Memorial of Bishop Onderdonk, and to remit, without reserve or condition, the penalty to which he has so long and so patiently submitted.

SAMUEL SEABURY, *Rector.*

BENJAMIN A. MUMFORD,	}	<i>Wardens.</i>
FLOYD SMITH,		
WILLIAM H. WISNER,	}	<i>Vestrymen.</i>
THOMAS B. CODDINGTON,		
WILLIAM P. LEE,		
GEORGE PLATT,		
STEPHEN P. NASH,		
JOHN C. THATCHER,		
HENRY MEIGS, JR.,		
JOHN D. JONES,		

October, 1859.

The New-York Deputies, after arriving at Richmond, held a consultation respecting the best mode of presenting Bishop Onderdonk's Memorial to the House of Bishops.

Although they have as yet made no formal report, they would doubtless have made one at the Convention of this Diocese, held in 1860, had not the session been brought to such an abrupt termination by the improper introduction of extraneous business.

ACTION OF THE BISHOPS.

No report of the proceedings of the Bishops, respecting Bishop Onderdonk's Memorial, appears in the Journal of the House of Bishops—the only indication we have of the consideration of the subject being the simple announcement—

“On motion, the House resolved itself into a Council as Bishops.”

And immediately following it, without any mention of either vote or resolution, we read—

“The Bishops, as a Council, having risen, the House resumed its ordinary business.”

The first record of this kind appears on page 164 of the Journal,* showing that the consideration of the Memorial commenced October 10th; and the last, on page 192, showing that the final decision was made on the evening of October 19th.

At the first meeting Bishop McCoskry presented the Memorial, which was laid over until the following day, when, with other Memorials advocating the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, it was read. Bishop Meade, of Virginia, distinguished himself by presenting an unsigned paper, adverse to the restoration of the Bishop, but was not allowed to read it. An interesting question was started by Bishop Elliott, as to whether the Presenting Bishops should retire from the Council or vote on the case. Bishop Hopkins maintained that these Bishops were entitled to vote, denied the applicability of civil analogies, challenged the production of a single instance of a Bishop not acting, and doubted the retirement of civil prosecutors. Bishop Whittingham cited authorities establishing the opposite view. After further discussion a vote was taken on the subject, and it was decided by all against Bishops De Lancey and Whittingham—Bishops Otey, Elliott, and H. Potter, declining to vote. We have no means of ascertaining why the Provisional Bishop of New-York thought best to assume a position of neutrality, by declining to vote upon a question of this nature.

Long after the decision had been announced, Bishop Meade (one of the original Presenting Bishops) requested to be considered in the light of one declining to vote—leaving 25 ayes instead of 26.

The first resolution having an immediate bearing upon the case was offered by Bishop McCoskry, of Michigan, providing that the judicial sentence passed by the Court of Bishops upon Bishop Onderdonk, should be altogether remitted and terminated.

On Wednesday, October 12th, Bishop Scott, of Oregon, moved the indefinite postponement of the whole subject; but, on motion of Bishop Upfold, of Indiana, the proposition was laid on the table.

* The other records of Councils held on the case, may be found on the following pages of the Journal:—p. 165 (Oct. 11th); p. 169 (Oct. 12th); p. 173 (Oct. 14th); p. 176-7 (Oct. 15th); p. 179 (Oct. 17th); p. 184 (Oct. 18th); p. 187 (Oct. 18th, evening); p. 192 (Oct. 19th, evening.)

Bishop A. Lee, of Delaware, desired to postpone the further consideration of the subject until the following Monday, in order to give time for Opposition Memorials to come in. Bishops McCoskry, of Michigan, and De Lancey, of Western New-York, objected to this delay—its tendency being to *solicit* such Memorials—and suggested Friday. Bishop McIlvaine, of Ohio, proposed Saturday, but this was lost by a vote of 10 to 16, and Friday was at length agreed upon.

On Friday, October 14th, the Memorial from the Church of the Annunciation, New-York (see p. 142), together with various other petitions in favor of the restoration of the Bishop, were read in council. Sundry Opposition Memorials were also read, including a "Report of the Delegates of a congregation at Flushing."

Bishop Meade then desired to read a private letter, which he had received, opposing the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk; and, notwithstanding his request was denied, the letter was afterwards placed upon the table for the inspection of the members.

Bishop McCoskry then informed the Council that he had had no communication with Bishop Onderdonk, but that the Memorial and other documents had been placed in his hands by a portion of the New-York Deputation.

The question then came up on the adoption of the resolution of Bishop McCoskry, remitting the sentence of Bishop Onderdonk, in accordance with the first provision of Canon 11 of Title II. of Digest. It has been supposed by some that no vote was taken upon *unconditional restoration*; but, by reference to the Canon, it will be seen that the present motion amounted to the same thing—conformity to the language of the Canon, being thought essential; indeed, Bishop Polk objected to the resolution on the ground that it granted more than was asked. This, however, could not be the case, so far as Bishop Onderdonk was concerned, for no relief was ever sought or contemplated by him, upon any condition whatever.

The question was then taken by yeas and nays, and the resolution was defeated by a vote of twenty-six to eight. The following are the names of the Bishops who voted in the affirmative:

Right Rev. Bishop	OTEX,	of Tennessee.
" "	"	KEMPER, of Wisconsin.
" "	"	McCORKRY, of Michigan.
" "	"	DE LANCEY, of Western New-York.
" "	"	WHITTINGHAM, of Maryland.
" "	"	CHASE, of New-Hampshire.
" "	"	RUTLEDGE, of Florida.
" "	"	ODENHEIMER, of New-Jersey.

Here, again, and on a most important question, the Provisional Bishop of New-York, requested to be excused from voting, notwithstanding he had, in the Diocesan Convention, actually advised the unconditional restoration of their Right Reverend Father in God, in these words: "I would rather, gentlemen, that you should restore that individual (Bishop Onderdonk) to

jurisdiction untrammelled, and with no view of its being returned to me hereafter."

Before voting, Bishop Whitehouse, of Illinois, inquired whether this were final; if not, it might be voted on with intent to bring up other forms. This accounts, we suppose, for his voting in the negative.

Bishop Whitehouse then offered the following resolution:

Resolved, That the sentence of Suspension of the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., be, and hereby is remitted, with the restrictions and conditions on the exercise of Episcopal powers and offices within the Diocese of New-York, as set forth in the letter of the Right Rev. Benjamin T. Onderdonk to the Right Rev. Horatio Potter, D. D., a copy of which is appended to the extract of Proceedings of the Convention of the Diocese of New-York, in possession of this House, and on the satisfactory pledge of Bishop Onderdonk to the full effect and extent of that paper.

Some discussion occurred upon this resolution, and it was withdrawn by the mover on the next day, because it was obvious that it could not prevail, and in order to substitute one which it was hoped would satisfy a larger number. Bishop Whitehouse then offered the following:

WE, the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States, having duly considered the application of BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, Doctor in Divinity, and Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, to be relieved from the sentence of suspension passed on the third day of January, in the year of our Lord eighteen hundred and forty-five, in the following words, to wit:—

"It is hereby ordered and declared that the sentence of the Court is, suspension from the Office of a Bishop in the Church of God, and from all the functions of the sacred ministry: and this Court do solemnly pronounce and declare that the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK is suspended from all exercise of his Episcopal and Ministerial functions—"

Do hereby declare, in pursuance of our Canonical power and discretion, as follows:

That the sentence of suspension of the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., Bishop as aforesaid, be so far remitted and modified that he may exercise the office of Bishop in the Church of God, to the extent, and that only, of performing Episcopal acts at the request of any Bishop having ecclesiastical jurisdiction within the limits of the Diocese of said Bishop, but so that he shall not exercise any jurisdiction, nor have a seat in the House of Bishops, but he may also exercise the sacred functions of the Priesthood, subject to the Canons and authority of the General Convention.

Resolved, That the above be the judgment and action of the House of Bishops, in Council assembled, on the application of the Right Rev. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D.

The New-York Deputies unanimously approved of this resolution, considering it the best that could be done at the time. It was, however, lost by a vote of twenty-four to nine.

The next motion was that of Bishop De Lancey, providing for the remission of the sentence, on Bishop Onderdonk placing in the hands of the Presiding Bishop a full resignation of his jurisdiction. This resolution

assumed the present conditional assent of the Bishops, without the reference to them, individually, required by Canon 2 of 1850, Sec. 6, and rendered the restoration complete, on the transmission of Bishop Onderdonk's satisfactory resignation to the Presiding Bishop.

Soon after this motion was offered, a telegram was sent to Bishop Onderdonk by the Rev. Dr. Wyatt, and a letter by the Rev. Dr. Vinton, communicating the fact, and inquiring whether the Bishop would resign jurisdiction. The following telegram was sent in reply:

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S TELEGRAM TO THE REV. DR. VINTON.

NEW-YORK Oct. 17th, 1859.

REV. FRANCIS VINTON, D. D.,
Richmond:

Res. No.

B. T. O.

The following letter was also sent by the Bishop to the Rev. Dr. Vinton, explaining his position in refusing to resign:

BISHOP ONDERDONK'S LETTER TO THE REV. DR. VINTON, ON
RESIGNATION OF JURISDICTION.

NEW-YORK, Oct. 17th, 1859.

MY DEAR DR. VINTON:—I sit down to reply to your letter of, I think, the 14th, without the advantage of having it before me. It came to hand this morning. I immediately prepared a telegram in the words which you doubtless anticipated—"Res. No." As the only son who is now a member of my household, was not, on account of his business, then available, and as I did not just now wish to be seen sending telegrams to Richmond, I wrote to my good and faithful friend, Dr. Eigenbrodt, requesting the favor of his attending to the telegraphing, and enclosed your letter for his perusal. My servant brought me word he was out, and would not be home until this evening. She left the packet. Hence my not having your letter now before me,* and the probable delay until to-morrow morning, of your receiving my telegram. In the heavy burden of responsibilities for opinions, principles, and determinations, which for long years has rested upon me, I have always endeavored—I trust, in faith and prayers—to have sound general principles to fall back upon, as a preparation for *right decision*, in all cases, as they may occur, making it my duty to decide and act. Never has conviction of duty more thoroughly and conscientiously taken possession of my mind than *now*, in the matter of resignation. I *cannot*—I *will not*. My time for settling up my accounts for eternity must be now near at hand. I *dare not*—no matter *what the considerations*—have recourse to an expedient which I consider *so wrong* as resignation.

With my prayers and blessing as for the Convention generally, so especially for the delegation from my own Diocese, I am, dear Doctor,

Yours, truly,

BENJ. T. ONDERDONK.

REV. FRANCIS VINTON, D. D.

* Application was recently made to the Rev. Dr. Eigenbrodt, for the purpose of obtaining the letter here referred to, but it had unaccountably disappeared. Its contents, however, are sufficiently indicated by the reply of the Bishop.

Bishop De Lancey's resolution, therefore, fell to the ground.

Bishop McIlvaine then remarked, that he would like to try some test question, without saying anything of the merits of the case, and accordingly moved to lay the "Memorial" on the table. The vote* resulted as follows:

FOR LAYING ON THE TABLE.

Right Rev. Bishop	MEADE, of Virginia,
" "	" HOPKINS, of Vermont,
" "	" SMITH, of Kentucky,
" "	" MCLVAINE, of Ohio,
" "	" POLK, of Louisiana,
" "	" ELLIOTT, of Georgia,
" "	" LEE, of Delaware,
" "	" JOHNS, Assistant, of Virginia,
" "	" EASTBURN, of Massachusetts,
" "	" BURGESS, of Maine,
" "	" GREEN, of Mississippi,
" "	" RUTLEDGE, of Florida,
" "	" DAVIS, of South Carolina,
" "	" ATKINSON, of North Carolina,
" "	" SCOTT, of Oregon,
" "	" LEE, of Iowa,
" "	" CLARK, of Rhode Island,
" "	" GREGG, of Texas.
" "	" BEDELL, of Ohio.

AGAINST LAYING ON THE TABLE.

Right Rev. Bishop	OTEY, of Tennessee,
" "	" KEMPER, of Wisconsin,
" "	" DE LANCEY, of Western New-York,
" "	" WHITTINGHAM, of Maryland,
" "	" COBBS, of Alabama.†
" "	" HAWKS, of Missouri,
" "	" UPFOLD, of Indiana,
" "	" WILLIAMS, Assistant, of Connecticut,
" "	" WHITEHOUSE, of Illinois,
" "	" BOWMAN, Assistant, of Pennsylvania.
" "	" WHIPPLE, of Minnesota,
" "	" ODENHEIMER, of New-Jersey,

The House then voted to permit the Bishop to withdraw his Memorial.

The Provisional Bishop of New-York continued throughout to preserve the condition of entire neutrality on the question, which he at first assumed, and did not depart from it to sanction any proposition for the relief of the Bishop of this Diocese.

* Bishops Brownell, of Connecticut, and Kip, of California, were not present at General Convention. Bishops McCoskry, of Michigan, and Potter, of Pennsylvania, were probably absent from the House when this vote was taken.

† Uncertain whether present or not; but if present, voted with minority.

The enemies of Bishop Onderdonk in the Council of Bishops, were evidently unwilling to incur the displeasure of the Church, by an open and straightforward non-concurrence in the proposition of Bishop Whitehouse for *partial* restoration. At a very late period of the session, the leading Bishops of the opposition signified to Bishop Whitehouse, who informed the New-York Delegation, that the difficulty in the way of the Council to restore *in part* was purely *canonical*. It was suggested, that if the House of Deputies would amend the Canon by inserting the words "or in part," between "altogether" and "remit," so that it would read "may altogether, or *in part*, remit," the scruples of the Bishops would be removed. The affect of this amendment would have been to restore Bishop Onderdonk to the exercise of the duties of his office, and keep jurisdiction suspended. His relative position to the Church at large would thus have been like that of a Bishop who had resigned jurisdiction, enabling him to exercise his priestly office, and to officiate as Bishop, whenever invited to do so by another Bishop. As soon as the above intelligence reached the House of Deputies, they resolved to make the matter easy for the Bishops; and, on motion of one of the Delegates from New-York—the Rev. Dr. Francis Vinton—they immediately and unanimously directed the Committee on Canons to report the suggested amendment to Canon 2 of 1847 (Canon 11., Title II. of Digest).* The Committee reported, and on the following day the Canon, so amended as to meet the expressed wishes of the Bishops, was sent up to them for concurrence,† with a degree of promptness and energy which could not fail to vindicate the determination of the House of Deputies to remove every obstacle in the way of the Council, and to do all in their power for the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk.

But, no sooner did the Bishops learn this unexpected action—no sooner did they realize the overpowering fact that the Canon was passed by the House of Deputies—that the representative body of the American clergy and laity was IN FAVOR OF THE IMMEDIATE RESTORATION OF BISHOP ONDERDONK TO OFFICE—than one of their number, Bishop Alfred Lee, moved to non-concur. And the majority non-concurred, giving as a reason that there was "*no sufficient cause, at this late period of the session, for its passage!*"‡ It is really painful to be obliged to add to these Memoirs that this Message of non-concurrence was not sent to the House of Deputies until the close of the session—just before the final adjournment—and then, as if to fill up the measure of Bishop Onderdonk's misfortunes, this late Message was also *wrongly endorsed* in misnaming the Canon, by the Secretary of the House of Bishops, the Rev. Dr. Balch!

The delay thereby occasioned, prevented the House of Deputies from

* See Journal, p. 120.

† See Journal, p. 128.

‡ Ayes 20; nays 7. See Journal, p. 218.

appointing a Committee of Conference, as moved by the Rev. Dr. Higbee* at too late a moment, but as soon as possible after the error of the Secretary was discovered. Thus, by the wiliness of his enemies in the House of Bishops, was the last and most commendable attempt on the part of the New-York Deputies to effect even the partial restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, entirely frustrated.

In order to understand why the friends of the Bishop advocated his restoration to the Episcopal office alone—leaving his jurisdiction in abeyance—notwithstanding he had expressly stated in his letter to the Rev. Dr. Vinton that he would not resign, it should be borne in mind that Bishop Onderdonk never intimated that any relief resulting from independent legislation would not be agreeable to him. But, on a high principle, he could not consent to become a party to any such measure as a condition precedent. He believed and said that he was in the hands of God, and that he could not do a more sinful act than to connect himself with a scheme or project to separate himself from his Diocese, or to do anything that would look like bargaining for restoration. Therefore it was that he at all times so promptly returned a negative reply to every proposition for relief, involving, directly or indirectly, the surrender of jurisdiction—and therefore it was that he did not hold himself at liberty to oppose the movements of those who deemed it their duty to act in his behalf without consultation with him.

Bishop Onderdonk was emphatically a man of principle; and, even life itself, as he once had occasion to declare, would have been yielded up by him, had it been demanded as a penalty for his love and maintenance of Truth.

“His self-control under the severe ordeal through which he was called to pass, enabled him to maintain an un murmuring, if not unbroken spirit; but the shrinking muscle and perishing vigor bore witness to the severity of his sufferings. By virtue of his office he was President of the Annual Convention of this Diocese; great ability and decision of character being required to discharge the duties of the office with integrity, honor, and dignity; and, having treasured up a vast store of rules and principles appropriate to such a position, he applied them with accuracy and force. Quick, correct, and positive in his decisions, order was sure to prevail, whilst dispatch of business invariably followed. Such profound, comprehensive, acute, and watchful business capacity and affability, combined with an unbending decision, resting on right and propriety, was never united in that office before nor since his administration. We doubt not that it was his watchful, strenuous, and conscientious persistence in his efforts to bring up the Church to her ancient and unrepudiated standards contained in the Scriptures and the Book of Common Prayer, that formed a chief though covert element in the persecution organized against him. He was the victim of popular clamor; and it was in obedience to popular clamor that the Redeemer of the world was nailed to the Cross. In imi-

* See Journal, p. 143.

tation of his Divine Master, the bearing of the Bishop, since his condemnation, has been a practical living prayer—‘Father, forgive them; they know not what they do.’

“The Church will long seek an individual as fully qualified by nature, mentally and physically, to superintend the religious and secular administration of the Diocese of New-York, involving vast temporal and spiritual interests, and demanding great bodily endurance in addition to rigid and correct acquittal of the multifarious duties of the position.

“That this Diocese should have been deprived of his watchful, firm, and conscientious oversight of its temporalities; of his stern, earnest, and substantial vindication of the Faith and Discipline of the Church; his almost perfect adaptability to meet the wants, and avoid and banish the insidious errors that so peculiarly beset and threaten the vital interests of the Church, at this more than at any previous period within the last three centuries; his ready apprehension of detail, and profound knowledge of principles, with the bodily energy to keep his great talents in active use without sinking under the exertion—that the Episcopate should have been deprived of the labors of one of its most valuable and efficient servants, on a charge, which at its utmost proved extent, was merely an offence against the strict conventional propriety of the day, and neither an overt nor designed infraction of Scriptural, moral, or ministerial obligation, will be viewed in the impartial page of history as one of the most singular acts of folly and effeminacy ever committed in an enlightened age by men of common sense; and only to be accounted for by a CONCENTRATION OF INTERNAL MOTIVES OF VARIOUS SHADES, AND OUTSIDE INFLUENCES OF ALL SORTS, BROUGHT TO A FOCUS ON THE HEAD OF A SINGLE INDIVIDUAL!

Appendix.

THE CAREY CASE.*

ARTHUR CAREY, whose Ordination formed a remarkable epoch in the Episcopate of Bishop Onderdonk, was born in the vicinity of London, on the 26th of June, 1822, and was eight years of age when his father removed to this country. He remained in this city, under his father's roof, until he was eleven and a half years old, at which time he was placed, in company with his two brothers, under the care of Bishop Hopkins, of Vermont, in whose family he resided for three years. At the age of twelve years, he signified to his father his desire to devote himself to the Ministry, and from that hour never once faltered or varied from his purpose. At about the age of thirteen, he received the Holy Rite of Confirmation at the hands of Bishop Hopkins, and was shortly after prepared for his first reception of the Holy Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. In January, 1836, he was admitted into the Sophomore class of Columbia College, from which he graduated in 1839, at the head of his class, delivering, as is customary, the Greek oration on that occasion. In October, 1839, at the age of seventeen years and four months, he entered the General Theological Seminary, and on the completion of his course in June, 1842, received the usual testimonial of the institution. Being at this time only twenty years of age, and desirous of enjoying the library and other advantages of the Seminary, he continued (with leave of the proper authorities), to reside in the building (having no other connection with the institution), and to pursue his studies in private, until he was of age for Holy Orders. While connected with the Seminary and residing in it, he conciliated, in a remarkable degree, the love and respect of its able and learned Professors and of his fellow-students. On the 2d of July, 1843, he was admitted to the Holy Order of Deacons, in St. Stephen's Church, New York, by Bishop Onderdonk, at which time the Rev. Drs. Anthon and Smith publicly protested against his Ordination, and on the second Sunday of October became Assistant Minister of the Church of the An-

* See pages 13, 51, 53.

nunciation. On the 23d of March, 1844, he embarked with his father for Havana, for the benefit of his health, and died from bleeding at the lungs on the 4th of April, and on the next day (Good Friday) was buried at sea, about fifteen or twenty miles N. E. of the Moro Castle, Havana. The Rev. Dr. Seabury, whose Assistant he was, says of him :* “He loved his Church and ours, my brethren, with a filial love; he sought to do all that she enjoined; he coveted nothing which she forbade; he condemned nothing which she approved, and he approved nothing which she obliged him to condemn. * * * * For myself, I can say, that all my intercourse with Mr. Carey—and I believe he opened to me on this subject his inmost soul—never excited a suspicion in my mind that he had any sentiment towards the Roman Communion inconsistent with an honest and hearty allegiance to his own Church; nor do I at all doubt that, had he lived, he would have continued faithfully and steadfastly to serve at our Altars, and, by a patient continuance in well-doing, have put to silence the obloquy of the world.”

[From a Correspondent of *The Churchman*, July 8, 1843.]

ACCOUNT OF THE ORDINATION.

MR. EDITOR—Having been present last Sunday morning at the Ordination at S. Stephen's Church, and supposing that the extraordinary circumstances attending it will, of course, become matter of public comment and remark, I beg leave to state those circumstances as they actually occurred, that your readers may be in possession of the truth in the case; to say nothing of the liberty I shall take in the said matter of comment and remark.

At this Ordination there occurred, I believe, the first instance in this country of action under the call made upon the people for showing any impediment or notable crime for the which a candidate presented ought not to be ordained. The call having been made by the Bishop, the Rev. Hugh Smith, D. D., rector of S. Peter's Church in this city, and the Rev. Henry Anthon, D. D., rector of S. Mark's Church in this city, duly habited in canonicals, arose in a pew which they occupied in the middle aisle, and each read a paper which had been drawn up with much lawyer-like formality, bringing against one of the candidates, as an impediment for the which he ought not to be ordained, the accusation that he held doctrines adverse to those of the Church, and too nearly bordering on popery, and referring for proof to statements and circumstances within the Bishop's knowledge.†

* *The Joy of the Saints*: A Discourse on the Third Sunday after Easter, A. D. MDCCCXLIV., being the first Sunday after the intelligence of the death of the Rev. Arthur Carey, A. M.

† The following are the papers alluded to :

Document read by Dr. Smith, at S. Stephen's, July 2, upon the call of the Bishop.

Upon this solemn call of the Church, made by you, Reverend Father in God, as one of its chief pastors, I, Hugh Smith, Doctor in Divinity, a presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New-York, and rector of St. Peter's Church, come forth, in the name of God, to declare, before Him and this congregation, my solemn conviction and belief that there is a most serious and weighty impediment to the Ordination of Mr. Arthur Carey, who has now been presented to you to be admitted a deacon, founded upon his holding sentiments not conformable to

These papers having been read, the Bishop rose and expressed himself to the following effect, and I believe in the following words:

"The accusation now brought against one of the persons presented to be ordered deacons has recently been fully investigated by me with the knowledge and in the presence of his accusers, and with the advantage of the valuable aid and counsel of six of the worthiest, wisest, and most learned of the presbyters of this Diocese, including the three who are assisting in the present solemnities. The result was, that there was no just ground for rejecting the candidate's application for Holy Orders. There is consequently no reason for any change in the solemn Service of the day, and therefore *all* these persons, being found meet to be ordered, are commended to the prayers of the congregation."

The Litany was accordingly immediately said, and the Service went on without further interruption.

During the whole of this most extraordinary scene, it was delightful to witness the entire absence of all appearance of excitement on the part of the very large congregation. I hope that my faith does not take a misguided direction in attributing this, with humble and cordial gratitude, to God's special presence with His Church, and the COMFORTER'S blessing on the decent, orderly, and conservative character of our beloved portion of it. The two reverend gentlemen above named were, I believe, the only persons present who disturbed "our solemn Litany" by taking their hats and leaving the Church. They were certainly the only clergymen who separated from their brethren who came to feed on the banquet of the most heavenly food of the Holy Eucharist.

On this most extraordinary affair I beg leave to make a remark or two.

I am not quite sure that these protesting gentlemen had a clear right to do what they did.

The Bishop's call is, according to the Ordinal, made "*unto the people.*" May there not be a doubt whether a *clergyman*, who has had, in his proper place, ample opportunity to make objections and enter protests, is here authorized to renew them in public?

Again: The case now before us is not, I humbly conceive, within the purview of the rule of the Ordinal. It was an adjudicated case—a matter in which the Bishop had made the decision which belonged of right to him. It could give him no new light on the momentous question respect-

the doctrines of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States of America, and in too close conformity with those of the Church of Rome, as more fully set forth in a protest from me, placed in your hands yesterday. Now, therefore, under a sacred sense of duty to the Church, and to its Divine Head, who purchased it with His blood, I do again, before God and this congregation, thus solemnly and publicly protest against his Ordination to the Diaconate.

Dated this 2d day of July, 1843.

HUGH SMITH.

Document read by Dr. Anthon, at S. Stephen's, upon the call of the Bishop.

REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

I, Henry Anthon, Doctor in Divinity, a presbyter of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of New-York, and rector of St. Mark's Church, in the Bowery, being present in S. Stephen's Church on this Third Sunday after Trinity, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and forty-three, the time appointed by the Bishop for an Ordination of Deacons, and being under a *firm and full persuasion in the case*, as has been heretofore stated in a written communication made to you, dated the first day of July of the same year, do now come forth, and in the name of God, show, as an impediment, that Arthur Carey, who has at this time been presented to be admitted deacon, *holds things contrary to the doctrine of the Protestant Episcopal Church in these United States, and in close alliance with the errors of the Church of Rome.*

Dated this 2d day of July, 1843.

HENRY ANTHON.

ing the fitness of the individual for Orders. That question, on the very point referred to, he had settled. The Church evidently supposes a case into which the Bishop *is to inquire*. In this case the accusers knew full well that he *had inquired*, and had accordingly made his official decision. I see not then how it can be viewed otherwise than as a disorderly, and of course unchristian and unchurchlike procedure. It strikes me that it was but an appeal to the people—an effort to enlist their feelings, prejudices, and passions—against a solemn and orderly ecclesiastical decision. It reminds me of what is probably, Mr. Editor, in the vivid but painful recollection of some of your older readers, “*A Solemn Appeal to the Church*” of former days. Whether the cases are analogous in the matter of *minuting down for publicity* the substance of *private conversations and interviews*, time perhaps will show.

And now, in what light will a sound and good Churchman view this whole affair? The Bishop summons eight presbyters to an examination of a candidate who has been represented to him as unsound in the faith. He and six of the presbyters are of opinion that the representation is not true. The two disappointed presbyters make a public appeal against their Bishop and brethren. I know that the ungodly, disorganizing, and radical *spirit of the age* runs strongly counter to the conclusion which I am so old-fashioned and Churchlike as to favor. I submit it, however, to such as are not unwilling to let Gospel and Catholic views prevail with them, maugre their hostility to the spirit of the age.

Those who have ill-will at Zion, and desire to look at her with an evil eye, will thank the gentlemen who have thus encouraged them to say, *There, there, so would we have it*. The agitators in this matter will undoubtedly be greatly lauded. Their anti-puseyitism will call forth many a note of praise. From all this, however, I anticipate no permanent or serious evil. The present day is perpetually manifesting wonderful interpositions, controllings, and overrulings of Providence in behalf of the Church. On these are based my hopes; and I would humbly and affectionately call on all who have true love for Zion to be much in prayer, that all may turn to her good, and especially keep ever near their heart the gracious counsel to the Church, of “the Lord God, the Holy One of Israel,” “IN QUIETNESS AND IN CONFIDENCE SHALL BE YOUR STRENGTH.”*

N. E. O.

P. S.—As the names and titles of the accusers in this matter were so formidably announced to the congregation, it is but just that the public should know, that besides their Diocesan, those against whom they have arrayed themselves are, with yourself, Mr. Editor, the Rev. Drs. Berrian and McVickar, and the Rev. Messrs. Price, Higbee, and Haight, who were associated with Drs. Smith and Anthon as examiners in the case in which the latter have thus appealed against the regular and orderly decision.

REMARKS.

The following remarks upon the case we take from an editorial in the same number of *The Churchman* :

“By the Constitution of the Church, the power of Ordination rests in the Bishop alone, to be exercised in conformity with canonical regulations, for the violation of which he is liable to impeachment and to trial

* Isaiah 30: 15.

by his peers. Of the fitness of the candidate, *the canonical regulations being complied with*, the Bishop is the sole judge, and by his decision the Church must abide; there being no power in the presbytery or the laity to compel him to admit to the Order of Deacons one whom he deems unmeet, or to deter him from admitting one whom he considers meet for that holy office. In the present instance, all the canonical requirements had been observed; the testimonials of the Standing Committee had been received; and the regular examinations had been held; and this being done, the Bishop might, had he seen fit, have proceeded to ordain the candidate without further action, and with strict canonical propriety. But did he do this? On the contrary, when he heard of allegations against the candidate's doctrinal soundness, he made it a point to see the candidate and to examine him privately and for his own satisfaction. But did he *then* ordain him? So far from it, that he appointed a special examination, to be conducted in his presence, by eight of his presbyters; and it was only when, in addition to all the canonical testimonials and regular examinations, and his own private examination, he had the recommendation of six out of eight presbyters whom he had summoned to a special consideration of the case, that he proceeded to the solemn act of Ordination. Now it is hard for us to see on what principle a presbyter could be justified in entering a protest against an Ordination by his Bishop in any case in which the canonical requirements have been observed; much more, in a case where so much had been done over and above what the Canons require. What *is* such a protest? what does it mean? and why is it made? Among Presbyterians, where the power of Ordination is vested in the body of Presbyters, and where a question of this sort would be decided by a plurality of votes, a protest on the part of dissentients would be perfectly intelligible. Among Congregationalists who hold that the power of Ordination emanates from the people, a protest read *in the presence of the congregation* would be a sensible act. But what meaning or what sense it can have in the Church of God, where the power of Ordination is held to derive from our Lord and to be vested in the Bishop alone, we are utterly at a loss to conceive. Was it meant to inform the Bishop that the Ordination was considered objectionable by the protesting presbyters? This was needless; for he knew the fact. Was it meant to bring those objections to the knowledge of the congregation? This also was needlessly obtrusive, for the matter was not one which it belonged to them to decide. Was it meant to inform the religious public that the Rev. Henry Anthon, Doctor in Divinity, and rector of St. Mark's Church in the Bowery, and the Rev. Hugh Smith, Doctor in Divinity, rector of St. Peter's Church, Chelsea, censured the conduct of their Bishop in the premises? But surely a time and place more fitting might have been found to convey this important announcement to the world. Or finally, was it meant to intimidate the Bishop, and divert him from the discharge of a duty which he had resolved to perform? If so, it met with all the consideration which it deserved; the protest being suffered to vanish like a puff of smoke, and the reverend protesters to follow it."

[From *The Churchman*, July 15, 1843.]

TO THE CHURCH.

The undersigned, members of the Examining Committee in the recent case of Mr. Arthur Carey, candidate for Orders, in conjunction with the Rev. Drs. Smith and Anthon, feel themselves called upon by the published statement of the two latter gentlemen, thus far to reply :

First. In justice to themselves, to decline definitively any defence of an act on their part of purely canonical discretion.

Secondly. In justice to Mr. Carey, solemnly to declare, that the answers of the candidate, as given in the above pamphlet, do not convey the full and fair impression produced on their minds by his examination; and that, in their judgment, such statement is calculated to mislead the public mind, and to do injustice to all parties concerned in his examination and subsequent Ordination.

With this summary notice of the statement above alluded to, the undersigned hold their own duty to the Church, touching this matter, to be fully and finally absolved.*

WILLIAM BERRIAN,
JOHN MCVICKAR,
SAMUEL SEABURY,

JOSEPH H. PRICE,
EDWARD Y. HIGBEE,
BENJAMIN I. HAIGHT

NEW-YORK, *July 19, 1843.*

REV. DR. HIGBEE ON THE SPECIAL EXAMINATION.

Whereas, in a certain pamphlet entitled "The True Issue for the True Churchman," I understand six presbyters of the Church to be charged with having advised the Bishop to ordain a man who came seeking the Diaconate with "a double creed in his hand—the Creed of Pius IV. and the Thirty-nine Articles—the Prayer-book and the Missal;" and whereas I understand this charge to be based upon sentiments expressed by the candidate in a conversation with the Rev. Dr. Smith, reported on pp. 8, 9, 10—29, 30, 31, of the aforesaid pamphlet;—and upon his answers in the special examination, held on the 30th of June, at which examination *the materiel of the reported conversation was made the subject of questions put to the candidate, so that the examination covered the entire conversation*; and whereas I attended the said examination on the 30th of June, and heard every question proposed to the candidate and every answer thereto—I now solemnly, to the best of my knowledge and belief, declare the charge to be entirely untrue. I speak not of the reverend authors of the pamphlet, nor of their motives, but of the charge itself; and that, let men qualify and explain, and color it as they will, is UNTRUE. Mr. Carey did not come to us with a double creed—with the Creed of Pope Pius, nor with the Roman Missal. He came to us, and went from us to the Bishop, with the Creed of the Church Catholic in his hand—with *no Romish additions thereto*. He professed no other creed—he came to us with our Prayer-book in his hand—he came to us and said concerning the Thirty-nine Articles, that though, according to Bishop White's opinion, an *ex animo* assent to them may not be obligatory in the American Church, *he for his part did subscribe them ex animo*—(see pp. 9, 10, 21, of the "True Issue," where a contrary impression is distinctly conveyed)—his faith was not corrupted by a single article peculiar to the Romish Church. In charity to the members of that large communion, he thought it possible that they might honestly explain some of their distinctive doctrines consistently with the true faith, so as to relieve themselves from the fatal charge of apostacy, and bring their souls within the fold of salvation; while at the same time he deplored the corruptions of their Church, he repudiated her errors, and turned his face steadfastly away from her Altars.

* It was afterwards thought necessary to reply at length to the statement of the Rev. Drs. Smith and Anthon.

Can this be so? Did not Mr. Carey, in answer to the very first question in his conversation with Dr. Smith, and in his examination, appear to regard with complacency the alternative of seeking Holy Orders in the Church of Rome in case they should be denied him in our Church? And did he not, in answer to another question, say in effect, that in his opinion there is no real difference between the creeds of the respective Churches? NO!

The first question suggested the possibility of his being turned out of the Church of his fathers—of being denied admission to the Holy Ministry, to which he felt himself moved by the Spirit of God, which from childhood had been the object of his fondest hopes, and of the hopes of his friends,—for which his father had, with a solicitude and pious care rarely exhibited, sought to prepare him—for which during long years he had studied and watched and prayed—foregoing even the innocent recreations of youth, and counting naught else dear to him in comparison with being thoroughly furnished for the good work. Now just on the threshold of the Ministry,—with the object of his hopes almost within his grasp,—he is sternly asked by those who have authority to test his qualifications, what he will do if all the plans of his life are frustrated, and all the hopes of his devoted father and anxious friends are disappointed? What he will do, (ay, in all future time, for there is no limit set by the question), if the call to the Ministry which his heart has so long recognized and cherished, shall be suppressed by the mandate of ecclesiastical power! *What will he do? Will he seek the Ministry of the Church of Rome?* To such a question what could he reply? Alas, I knew too well the infirmities of my nature to anticipate that reply,—yet he nobly escaped the pitfall laid for his conscience. In that trying moment he retained his self-command. He did not answer, as did Hazael, when the prophet predicted his career of crime and blood, “*Is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?*” Nor yet did he say like the disciple who afterward denied his Master, “*Lord, though all men should be offended because of thee, yet will not I be offended;*” but in meekness and fear, mindful of the words of wisdom, “*he that trusteth his own heart is a fool,*” he answered for the *present*, and not for the *future*, except to express humbly his trust that he should remain a layman in his own communion. He would not for all time to come, and in view of the trying circumstances set before him by the question, presumptuously say what might be *possible* or *impossible* for him, a frail creature, to do or to suffer. He would be content to declare for the present, that he loved his Church,—he felt it to be his home,—and had no inclination to depart from it. The calm wisdom of the answer exceeded even the cruelty of the question.

* * * * *

But aside from these details, how did it happen that if Mr. Carey is really above the suspicion of Roman tendencies, his examination should be *so filled with Romanism*? Why did not he, as do other candidates at the ordinary examination for Deacon's Orders, simply give an account of his faith as a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church, without entering into those innumerable refinements, and explanations, and distinctions which marked his answers respecting the tenets of the Church of Rome? It all happened in this wise:—A simple account of his faith as a member of the Protestant Episcopal Church was not sought by his two chief examiners [Drs. Smith and Anthon] on this occasion! *They filled the examination with Romanism*, and rendered necessary every explanation, and every refinement, and every distinction of Mr. Carey by their crude and torturing questions. This was not the ordinary examination of a candidate for Deacon's

Orders; Mr. Carey had already sustained *that* satisfactorily to his examiners, and creditably to himself. This was a special examination, to the appointment of which the Bishop was moved by the representations of one, I believe, of the reverend authors of the "True Issue." That reverend author had heard a *rumor*, which, nourished by the prejudices of the day, had acquired an imposing tone when it reached him. He conversed with Mr. Carey on the subject of the *rumor*, and recorded (as far as memory served) the conversation. He then, in the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, expressed his conviction that there is in that institution an "undercurrent of *Romanism*," and rather hastily (as many thought) *pledged himself* to sustain his assertion before the Church if necessary, by documentary proof—which documentary proof was understood to be the record of his conversations with Mr. Carey. When the special examination was ordered, and this gentleman and friend were appointed as two of the examiners, it doubtless appeared necessary to them to redeem the pledge which had been given before the Trustees, and to confirm the representations which had been made to the Bishop. With no *intention*, of course, of doing the slightest injustice to Mr. Carey, or of eliciting anything but *truth*, they were nevertheless in *fact* (one of them at least was) *committed to the issue, and bound to prove him a Romanist, or strongly inclined to Romanism, if it could be done.* The prepared and condensed, though not *precise* questions which they brought with them to the examination, were confined to the topics connected with the Church of Rome,—having respect not merely to the acknowledged abuses and corruptions, but to the entire doctrinal and disciplinary system of that Church, *and to their own views of that system.* Mr. Carey, therefore, did not choose his own topics, nor express his sentiments upon those topics in his own way, nor give the examination the color of his own mind. He must answer strictly the question proposed, however vague and imperfect it might be. Any departure from the crude letter would be deemed an evasion; and the slightest remonstrance would supply food for suspicion. The task was his, fettered as he stood before the committee, to extricate if he could, not only his *faith*, but the speculations at any time indulged by his ardent mind, and casual remarks, not only which *he had made*, but those which he *might possibly have made* in the freedom of social intercourse,—from the strong and cunning hand of a zeal backed by popular prejudice, which seemed resolved to force him, against the pleadings of reason and humanity, from his native fold to that of Rome.

Mark how an idle rumor has brought evil upon the Church! The rumor prepared the way for an *adventurous assertion* in the Board of Trustees of the Seminary, and elsewhere. The adventurous assertion rendered the *solemn pledge* necessary. The pledge rendered the *peculiar process* of the special examination necessary. In the opinion of six of the examiners, and of the Bishop, no Romanism was proved upon the candidate—the *pledge was not yet accounted to have been redeemed.* Then the *protest* against the Bishop's decision became necessary. The protest brought the matter before the public; and straightway friends and enemies, the daily and the weekly, the secular and the religious press, become clamorous for an explanation. Then came forth that most astounding production of the age, "The True Issue for the True Churchman," by Drs. Smith and Anthon.—*Letter to Editor of The Churchman, 1843.*

SUBSEQUENT EVENTS.

The intrepidity and energy displayed by Bishop Onderdonk throughout the whole of this trying controversy, and especially in the Diocesan Con-

vention of 1843, inspired the Diocese with the liveliest sentiments of gratitude and admiration. One illustration of this feeling may be mentioned. Immediately after the rising of the Convention, a body of the Clergy of the Diocese, to the number of sixty or seventy, as many indeed as had not left the city, and on a short notice could be assembled, met together, and having made the due preliminary arrangements, moved in procession to the Episcopal residence, and through the Rev. Dr. Wainwright, whom they had chosen as their spokesman on the occasion, tendered to Bishop Onderdonk an earnest expression of their thanks, and of their confidence in the wisdom and purity of his administration of the Diocese. At the conclusion of the interview, the Clergy present knelt down and received the Apostolic Benediction. That was a proud day for the Clergy and for the Bishop, when, without distrust or suspicion, but in the frank and cordial interchange of mutual confidence, they gave free utterance to sentiments worthy of the relation which subsists between a spiritual father and his children in Christ Jesus. None who were present on the occasion can ever forget the heartiness, eloquence, and pathos of Dr. Wainwright's address, nor the impressive solemnity of Bishop Onderdonk's response.

Pending this controversy, a paper had been established in New-York, by the Rev. R. C. Shimeall, one of the opposition, under the name of the *Protestant Churchman*. This paper, under the auspices of Dr. Anthon and others, soon became the accredited organ of the opposition.—*Voice of Truth*, p. v.

"OUTSIDE INFLUENCES" AGAINST RESTORATION.

The following passages are extracted from the letters of "ALIIQUIS," the Special Correspondent of the *New-York Churchman*, at the General Convention of 1859.

It is painful to witness the attempts of the enemies of Bishop Onderdonk to prejudice public feeling against him. Yesterday morning (October 14th) two disgraceful pamphlets were distributed through the Church.* One of which was entitled "A Catechism for the Times; that is to say, An Instruction to be learned by the Members of the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, assembled in the City of Richmond, October, 1859." Then follow questions and answers raking up all the abominable and malicious charges against that persecuted prelate. I shall not quote from it; for aside from the form in which it is put, being a malicious caricature upon the Church Catechism, its contents are not worthy to appear in any respectable print. The other, entitled "A Statement of the Facts," would be more justly labelled "A Statement of Lies," for Bishop Onderdonk was *not* guilty of the offences charged.

Upon complaint being made by one of the delegates that these scandalous pamphlets should be forced upon them, and the house of God thus shamefully desecrated, the President (Dr. Creighton) said that he had also found them upon his desk, and that hereafter nothing should be placed in the pews without his knowledge; that while he was President of the Convention he would not allow it, and that he considered the distribution of these pamphlets an insult to the House.†

* S. Paul's Church, Richmond, Virginia.

† The Sexton of S. Paul's Church, on being interrogated on the subject, bitterly complained that he had unwittingly been made the instrument of the mischievous plotters, by consenting to distribute the pamphlets, under a pledge of secrecy, as to the persons who had committed them to his charge.

We can only say, that black must be the heart, and seared the conscience, of any man who could thus strive to injure the character of an absent, helpless Bishop. His friends have published nothing in his defence; his enemies have put forth their utmost exertions against him. They shall fall into the pit which they have digged for another, and the snare which they have laid privily shall catch themselves. Truth must finally prevail. If not here, certainly in the world beyond, the right shall triumph and the wicked shall not go unpunished. * * * * *

It is now ascertained that the Bishops have refused the Prayer of Bishop Onderdonk. We almost involuntarily ask, is this the result of all the prayers, and hopes, and labors of so many in the Diocese of New-York? Can it be that for three more years her Bishop shall sit in ashes, without one word of consolation? Has not mercy perished from the earth, and justice from the sons of men? *

You cannot tell, Mr. Editor, what means have been resorted to, to influence the Bishops against the Memorial. I will give you one instance. A petition has come into my hands addressed to the Right Rev. Alfred Lee, Bishop of Delaware, by D. D. Barnard, of Albany, stating that he also sends copies of it to "some of the other Bishops." In it occurs the following passage:

"It will hardly be denied, I think, in any quarter, that eight out of ten of all the men and women of the laity in the Diocese are utterly opposed to his restoration to the Diocese. I believe there is not one parish in ten, if there be one in twenty, where his services as Bishop would be gladly or even willingly received. . . . Should the suspended Bishop be restored to his jurisdiction, there would be much of calm resignation to a most painful but inevitable infliction; there would also be much, and probably much more, of silent but resolute resistance to it. Indeed, nothing seems to me clearer, than that he can never perform Episcopal services anywhere again in this Diocese, without doing vastly more harm than good!"

Again:

"And should there be no way of avoiding this [restoration to jurisdiction], if the sentence is touched at all, then I do not hesitate to say, that much as I or any body may commiserate the condition of the suspended Bishop [away with such commiseration!—it is mockery!] and may desire to see some relief extended to him, it would be the solemn duty [!] of the House of Bishops, as guardians of the honor, the purity, the peace, and safety of the Church at large in the United States, not to touch the sentence at all." [!]

We can, for the present, only bow in resignation, praying God to forgive all the Bishop's enemies, persecutors, and slanderers, and turn their hearts.

[From *The Churchman* of Sept. 29, 1853.]

DR. ANTHON ON RESTORATION.

We find the following simple-hearted announcement in the *Times* of the 22d inst.:

"We are authorized and requested to state that the Rev. Dr. Anthon, of this city, has desired that his name might be withdrawn from among the signatures to the petition to the House of Bishops for the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk."

That Dr. Anthon should put his hand to the plough and look back, is scarcely worthy of remark, so far as his conduct, in thus seeking to influ-

ence his associates, may be heeded by intelligent and generous minds. No one at all familiar with the fact that he was one of the rival candidates for the Episcopate in this Diocese in 1829, when Bishop Onderdonk was elected, can fail to remember the bitter hostility with which he has ever since pursued the successful candidate. His opposition to the Bishop had become proverbial for years before the trial, and contributed greatly to stimulate the evil passions of that eccentric and dangerous divine, the Rev. James C. Richmond, with whom he acted in concert, during the memorable season in which the latter was "employed" (we use Mr. Richmond's own language,) "to hunt up charges against the Bishop." The Carey Ordination also afforded him a rich repast. It was his meat and drink to oppose whatever Bishop Onderdonk might plan or devise. His opposition to the Bishop in Convention has always been signally marked, and oftentimes ridiculous even to himself. We put it to the reverend gentleman under consideration, whether he has ever spoken a kind word to the Bishop, or made him a social call—we had almost asked whether he has ever spoken to him at all—since the hour in 1829, when he was overlooked by a large portion of the delegates to the Convention at the time of the election of Bishop Onderdonk.

Has not the bitter disappointment of that event constrained Dr. Anthon to misconstrue and exaggerate every syllable of dissatisfaction that has since been uttered in his presence concerning the Bishop? And are not these things characteristic of him? Is it then to be wondered at, that the Rev. Dr. Anthon, should advertise that he has withdrawn *his* name from a petition, which, in all probability, he had been strongly, if not heroically, urged to sign? Is it, we ask, a thing to be circulated by the press as of serious moment that a man of such mental organization, and in such a position, should suddenly bethink himself that he was about to render essential service to the very individual whose election to the Episcopate had contributed more than any one thing, by the rebuke thus given to his ambition, to enable him to ascertain his true level in this Diocese?

In thus discharging the obligations we are under to ourselves, the Church, and the Diocese of New York, we must acknowledge that we have performed a task deeply humiliating and painful. Lamentable, indeed, is it that clergymen of the Church, who, from their learning and talents, ought to be her shining lights, should thus subject themselves, by manifest deviations from the plainest Christian duties, to such strictures as these.

Men peculiarly qualified by mental organization to form disturbing elements in the ecclesiastical fabric, having once found admission to the Ministry of the Church, cannot, it is true, be excluded from her Councils, but if properly presented before the Church, their malicious oppositions and pestiferous influences may be greatly modified. If the Church would only go forward in her full power and strength, manifesting forth the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, she would find herself again blessed with the original power to furnish laborers meet for the Master's service. But organized and stultified as she is at present, we must make the most of that numerous but unfortunate and pitiable class of human beings to which such clergymen unquestionably belong, and from which it is only possible for them to escape, by prayer and supplication before God for a *good conscience* and a *right judgment*.

Since the above was penned, the following communication, published in the *Express* of the 27th, in relation to Dr. Anthon's public withdrawal of his name from the petition, was put into our hands. Supporting as it does our own positions, we give it a place in our columns:

To the Editors of the New-York Express :

We have scarcely been able to take up a newspaper for several days past without having our attention attracted by the card from a reverend gentleman of the Episcopal Church who, as he attaches such particular importance to the fact that he has withdrawn his name from the Memorial to the General Convention for the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, is as particularly desirous that the public should know it. It is not the object of your correspondent to discuss the merits of the question, whether there can be any impropriety or detriment to the Church in an act of charitable forgiveness by a Christian Legislative Body towards a man now approaching the verge of the grave, who, having suffered its proscription for so many years, has nevertheless been, doubtless, comforted with the assurance that, whatever errors he may have committed through life, have been long ago forgiven by his Heavenly Father, and of whose present sincerity of spirit or purity of heart there can be no question. But, the disposition evinced by a clergyman, occupying so prominent a position in the Church as this reverend doctor, to regale the public with an evidence of his bitter vindictiveness, when the withdrawal of his name from the Memorial could have been effected quite as surely in a more private way, is a lamentable illustration of that unchristian spirit which can suffer a minister of the Gospel to cherish feelings so utterly at variance with the doctrines he teaches. The reverend gentlemen having probably in contemplation the eagerness with which he cast the first stone, some fifteen years ago, seems quite as anxious to prove the permanency of his hatred by casting the last one. Let us hope, however, that the damage will not be as great as the originator seems to anticipate, and I think we are safe in feeling assured, whatever may be the effect of this single act on the General Convention, that it will be somewhat inferior to the reverend gentleman's expectation. The little circumstance which has called forth this communication, brings to the writer's painful remembrance that day in the history of our Church, when at the last Ordination, I believe, by our suspended Bishop, your correspondent witnessed the most striking illustration of ungovernable passion from this same clergyman, that ever disgraced a Christian assemblage, when, with a countenance paled by anger, he turned his back on the Liturgy of his Church and the Communion Table of his Lord, having struck the first blow on the wedge which divided the Church in this country. Placing these recollections together with this last act of the same spirit, it becomes apparent to any reasonable mind that whatever may be the extent of the reverend gentleman's knowledge in questions of theology, he has yet to learn the first rudiments of Christianity in the exercise of charity and love, and probably has more occasion than S. Paul to be cautious, "lest after having preached to others he himself should be a cast-away."

A CHURCHMAN.

[From *The Churchman* of October 6, 1859.]

THE DIOCESAN CONVENTION OF 1859 AND BISHOP ONDERDONK.

The prominent feature of the recent Diocesan Convention, was the case of Bishop Onderdonk, which, at the very last moment before the assembling of that body, it was announced would not be presented for action. This unexpected termination of the matter on the part of those who had originated and promoted the movement for the Bishop's restoration, was produced, it is understood, by the "pressure from without," coupled with the apprehension that the proposition could not command that support which was desirable and essential, and that defeat would forever preclude the possibility of the Bishop's restoration. It was authoritatively stated that the Memorial itself had been withdrawn by the Bishop, and all the papers in the case returned to their respective authors. Churchmen who had long and ardently labored in the good work, were suddenly admonished by the world that they should now be silent; that what they had already done in the fear of God and in love for the Church, on this interesting and recently absorbing topic, must be as though it had never been. "The peace of Zion," said the world, "must not be disturbed;" and the Church, awed into submission by the menacing mandate, pushed aside the object of her

solicitude and care, at the very moment that he was throwing himself upon her hands for mercy and protection! But so it was; and so we record the sudden and humiliating turn given to the case.

As soon as this remarkable state of things reached the ears of Dr. Vinton, he gave notice that he would bring the case before the Convention, even at the hazard of being left alone in the attempt. This announcement went through the House like an electric shock; and in twenty-four hours the subject was spoken of in every part of the city. With a single exception, the entire lay delegation from Trinity Church were arrayed in open hostility to the measure. But neither they nor the most urgent remonstrances of numerous and long-tried yet mistaken friends of the Bishop, availed with Dr. Vinton. He had already declared what he intended to do; and great was the sensation, when the House fully realized, that among its distinguished members, there had been found one bold enough to state openly that he should stand forth, before the close of the session, as the unflinching advocate of immediate action—proclaiming, at the same time, the truth, the *whole* truth, concerning the men, the Memorial, and the other papers connected with this most extraordinary affair. He should also indicate, as far as in him lay, what he conceived to be the solemn duty of the Diocese of New-York to its stricken Head, the suspended, suffering Bishop.

Lamenting most deeply that he stood alone in what he was about to do, yet expressing his unshaken confidence in God as to the result, and turning to the lay delegation from Trinity, he said, with commanding dignity and grace: "Brethren, I am conscious of your united opposition;" then looking upon the Convention at large, he said: "I feel that I have at this moment, no sympathy in venturing to ask you to co-operate with me in the introduction of the great question I have at heart. But, brethren, I have a duty to perform, and, by God's help, I will perform it. I would not, I cannot, I *dare* not do less than I have proposed for myself on this occasion; and may God, Who has moved me thus to appear before you, so dispose your hearts and minds to receive what He shall give me grace and power to utter, that the resolution, which I shall presently submit, may find a merciful and unanimous response."

The entire speech of Dr. Vinton may not only be characterized as a bold and fearless exposition of the great question of Restoration; it was undoubtedly one of the most effective and stirring appeals ever made to a legislative body. The sympathy for which he had so recently sighed, begun to be strikingly manifested. The stillness of death pervaded the crowded church during the delivery of this brilliant effort, and so strong was the Christian feeling with which it inspired all who heard it, that, when the reverend doctor took his seat, instead of the dreaded resistance to the action proposed in the resolution, the utmost harmony and good feeling prevailed in every section of the house—the first movement being a kind and apologetic outburst on the part of the Rev. Drs. Hawks and Tyng, ably and successfully vindicating themselves against any possible misconception concerning the fidelity and good faith with which they had so perseveringly labored in the Bishop's behalf, up to the time of the meeting of the Convention. The Rev. Dr. Anthon then read a well-written digest of his own feelings, aiming particularly at nothing and nobody, except, *of course*, that it recommended *absolute resignation of jurisdiction* as the basis of Restoration. But, evidently, it made not the slightest impression on the members of the Convention. The old foe was expected to strike a much harder blow; and, had a vote been taken that evening, in all probability it would have been declared unanimous in favor of the

Restoration of the Bishop. But, as we are all more prone to sleep than to pray over what has been said or done in the evening, we were not surprised that the measure should have been opposed on the following day, and improperly commented upon by indiscreet persons. It *was* surprising, however, to find some of the delegates, both lay and clerical, including a popular preacher of one of our city churches, consolidating their scattered and feeble opposition, with no prospect before them but anarchy and strife, uttering sentiments and phraseology unfit for repetition in a public journal, making unmeaning and provoking amendments and motions for adjournment, and exhibiting, in open defiance of the Chair, a spirit of factious insubordination that should have secured their prompt expulsion from the house. Let Churchmen cease to rail against the secular press, or see to it that the secular element is at once excluded from the councils of the Church.

Thanks be to God, the "unruly wills and affections," and the bombast of the belligerents received at length a keen and timely rebuke from the Rev. Dr. Tyng, who, in a seasonable, well-directed, judicious, and eloquent speech, prepared the way for the final vote, the result of which, it is believed, will not only have its desired influence on the House of Bishops, but instruct us, one and all, of how little value is human calculation and forecast, when placed in the scale with strong convictions of religious duty and individual rights, and an unwavering faith in the power of the Holy Ghost.

[From *The Churchman* of Oct. 18, 1859.]

BISHOP ONDERDONK AND SECRET SESSIONS.

It is now ascertained that action was had on Friday last on the direct question of the *unconditional* restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, and that the vote stood *eight* in favor and *twenty-six* opposed. The final action of the House of Bishops upon his Memorial is looked for in this Diocese with hopeful and almost breathless anxiety. Daily and hourly the question is asked: "What action have the House of Bishops taken on the Memorial? Is there any news from Richmond concerning the Bishop? What are the Bishops doing? Is no one informed as to their proceedings? Are the Bishops afraid to let the Church know what they have to say on this absorbing topic? These and similar questions arising spontaneously in all sections of this great city, and coming to us also from different parts of the country, indicate how wide-spread and thorough is the conviction of the Diocese of New-York that, in the Providence of God, the time has come when Bishop Onderdonk should be restored to the exercise of his Episcopal functions; that he should no longer be compelled to live amongst us as though he were dead, whilst his heart is yearning for the gracious privileges so long denied and so earnestly prayed for by him in that touching and incomparable document now under consideration at Richmond (the Memorial), and which, for aught we know, may have been hurried into the hands of a Committee, without even being read before the House.

The voice of our recent Annual Convention tells also in thunder tones of a state of feeling in regard to the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, which, to say the least, should no longer be trifled with. The Diocese has long been brooding over the evils consequent upon the position of the House of Bishops towards a prelate of the Church under discipline—treated in a manner every way adapted to belie all disciplinary motives or intentions. uttered or implied, or floating in whatever shape through our

penal code. Say what you please, turn it over as you may, examine it carefully, you cannot escape the conclusion drawn from this practical repudiation of the Church's end of discipline. Such is the fearful example of the House of Bishops to the lambs of Christ's flock. Whether such painful effects be but the natural result of the unrestrained deliberations of secret sessions, we leave them to answer; only remarking, that it is a sad thing to see the Bishops of the Church repudiating either Christian doctrine or practice. Certain it is that their conduct towards Bishop Onderdonk finds no parallel in the history of the Church. We hesitate not to say, and leave it to the judgment of Christendom, that if the House of Bishops were arraigned at the Court of Heaven touching their treatment of the case of Bishop Onderdonk and his Diocese, the God whom this afflicted Prelate has prayerfully served during fifteen years of "indefinite suspension" and consistent religious bearing, would bring upon them a calamity entirely at variance with their preconceived opinions of righteous judgment.

We may be thought presumptuous or wanting in respect, for thus expressing ourselves concerning the Bishops of the Church; we intend nothing of the sort; and it should be remembered that we are advocating the cause of a Bishop; one who, though under discipline, is none the less their equal in rank. We must all do the work allotted us, and whenever we are compelled in our humble sphere to speak of the dignitaries of the Church, we shall hope to do so in that respectful tone which can alone secure to us their conviction of our sincerity and regard. As to our right to speak of the Christian bearing of their conduct we have no misgivings, with the Bible in our hand; and feel convinced that the ablest opponent of restoration in the secret conclave of mitred heads, could not gainsay or resist the force of our remarks on this point. The sword of the Spirit will penetrate and divide, even though it be in the hand of a child.

Manifestly and demonstrably true is it, that our Right Reverend Fathers, as a body, have not followed Christ for their example, if one may judge from what has found its way to the public, respecting the Diocese of New York and its Bishop. A worldly, time-serving policy may suggest potent reasons for not pulling out of the Bishop the stake that fastens his body to the ground; but that "love of Christ which constraineth us," and ever overflows in the Christian heart for helpless humanity, especially when the discipline of the Church has, confessedly, accomplished the work for which it was designed, cries aloud for *unconditional restoration*.

It is our opinion that if the sessions of the House of Bishops had been conducted openly in the face of all men, Bishop Onderdonk would not occupy his present humiliating position before the Church. No good and sufficient reason can be given for these secret sessions. We have yet to learn that they have a solitary defender in civil or religious life, outside of their own body. And has it not frequently occurred to the Bishops themselves, that secret sessions of Ecclesiastical bodies convened for legislative purposes, but especially when resolvable at pleasure into Courts for the trial of offences, are liable to untold abuse, dangerous alike to the character of institutions and individuals, and altogether unsuited to the free and enlightened government of the United States?

Humiliating and painful to the last degree is it, as well to the Diocese of New York as to the American mind, to be waiting in hourly anxiety to know the result of a *secret* deliberation involving the civil rights and official life of a Bishop, once the most powerful on the American Bench, and also the rights and privileges of the largest and most influential Diocese, with which he stands connected, though powerless by reason of his suspension.

If nothing else will bring the House of Bishops to abandon this anti-republican and destructive policy of discussing, deliberating, and legislating in *secret* concerning individual rights and privileges with which we are all more or less concerned, we trust that the same public opinion which they so strongly profess to repudiate, but which they so religiously observe and respect, will force them into a right judgment, by *demanding* admission to their deliberations.

The Rev. Dr. Adams, in a recent speech before the House of Clerical and Lay Deputies, remarked that—"No House of Bishops, save our own, since the creation of the Church, has ever been known to sit with closed doors. The first House of Bishops, composed of the Apostles, elders, and brethren, sat with open doors, and the public listened to their deliberations."

Why, then, should the members of the American branch of the Catholic Church be subjected to the evils growing out of such proceedings? Why should any one Diocese be kept in darkness respecting any inquisitorial examination which may suddenly be instituted concerning the conduct and character of its Diocesan, should he, from some disability, happen to be absent from the sittings of the House of Bishops? If the Holy Inquisition of the Roman Church, or something allied thereto or worse, is to be established in our midst by a conclave of our own Bishops, we are not among the number to yield. Neither do we mean to be taken by surprise; nor are we discoursing about a phantom. Already is the Church beginning to feel the withering influence of these secret inquisitorial bodies. The Diocese of New-York is groaning under the iron heel of the oppressor, who mocks the mournful appeal of its stricken Head with a taunt, by bidding him do some direful evil to himself and the Church, in order to effect his restoration—such a thing, for instance, as *the resignation of jurisdiction*, which, in our judgment, should only be yielded up, under the circumstances, with the natural life of the incumbent.

Resignation the condition of restoration! Why not *decapitation*? Surely that would be preferable, inasmuch as it would relieve his persecutors of their forebodings, lest at any time, as has been suggested, he should be found, by invitation, officiating or administering in the Diocese. Still "resignation" is the watch-word. "It will render him eligible." Hitherto, he was assured, by all that was sacred and solemn in human integrity and Episcopal character that "*penitence*" was all that was needed to secure to him the resumption of Episcopal powers. But alas for human promises and human hopes! Only a *short* time can elapse before Bishop Onderdonk and his relentless pursuers shall meet side by side at the bar of God. And, if we are at liberty to judge of trees by their fruits, many of his maligners and oppressors will wish themselves back in this sublunary sphere, if it were only long enough to say a single word, or cast a single vote, to relieve the broken and contrite heart of a loving and affectionate Christian Bishop. But it will then be too late!

Touching the undue exercise of Episcopal power, it may be well to remark, that only a few years ago, one of the members of the present House of Bishops gravely suggested the establishment of an Ecclesiastical censorship of the Press! To be sure it was publicly uttered, and as publicly and promptly denounced in these columns. But precisely how much attention was bestowed in secret session upon that interesting topic, we have no means of ascertaining. It was probably submitted to the Bench, and found to be a little too much at variance with the progressive spirit of the age.

Wanting confidence, as we frankly confess we do, in the tendency of secret sessions to exemplify and encourage those Christian virtues, the possession of which reflects such lustre on the Church of Christ, and the absence of which tends so materially to the dishonor of her name and the disgrace

of her high council chamber, we shall never relax our endeavors to assist the venerable body under consideration, in arriving at the wholesome conclusion to conduct their future legislation with less regard to the secrecy of their deliberations.

We are impelled to these remarks from a high sense of duty to the Church, rising above all personal or official considerations, and in the humble hope that they will contribute in some way, however remote, to the abandonment of a practice so hostile to the wishes and feelings of ninety-nine hundredths of the clergy and laity, and pregnant with evil in its bearings on all questions of vital importance to the Church.

Returning to the restoration of Bishop Onderdonk, we cannot but hope that something will yet be done, by the House of Bishops, to relieve both him and the Diocese of New-York from the anomalous position in which they have been, either accidentally or unavoidably, placed, ever since the year 1845; a state of things now provided against by legislation, and the benefits of which it is manifest is in the power of our Right Rev. Fathers to make available to the necessities of the case.

But after all, those who understand this question, and who were present at the late Annual Convention, must be convinced that this great matter of restoration is almost entirely in the hands of the Provisional Bishop of the Diocese. If he desires to see Bishop Onderdonk restored, and boldly advocates the measure as one perfectly compatible with the free exercise of his own rights and privileges, *it cannot fail to be accomplished*. The Bishops could not deny his request. He, therefore, above all others, is earnestly looked up to by the Diocese to whom in the presence of God and with great emotion, he solemnly said: "If I go to Richmond, you will find in me no enemy." Now we follow a great example when we take this declaration to imply *action*, prompt, efficient, timely, heartfelt action; if it does not, it is an unmeaning and valueless utterance; and that is something which our natural instincts forbid us to believe could emanate from the Christian gentleman and Bishop now Provisionally presiding over the affairs of this important Diocese.

[From *The Churchman*, December 27, 1860.]

OMISSION OF BISHOP ONDERDONK'S NAME FROM CONVENTION JOURNALS.

We have received the Journal of the Proceedings of the Seventy-seventh Convention of the Church in this Diocese, published for the Convention by Daniel Dana, Jr., 381 Broadway. Many matters for comment are suggested by a perusal of its formidable table of "Contents," some of which we hope shortly to find time to ventilate. We must, however, be satisfied, at the present time, with a simple allusion to the singular disappearance from the "List of the Clergy," of the name of Bishop Onderdonk, *the Bishop of the Diocese*.

It strikes us that there is a manifest propriety in printing the name of the Bishop along with that of the Provisional Bishop. Indeed, we can think of no good reason for excluding the name of the suspended Bishop, and thus blotting out the record of the folly which placed this Diocese in its present unfortunate position. It *may* be that Bishop Onderdonk himself requested the omission. Still "justice to the Church in the Diocese of New-York" requires that it should remain in its place upon the Journal. No one can suppose for a moment that Bishop Onderdonk is justified by the Church at large for not instituting civil proceedings for the recovery of his full salary, and consequent settlement of the vexed and ever-disturbing question

of restoration, especially when guaranteed against pecuniary loss by a disinterested layman of the Church. The fact that his peace of mind would thereby, have been disturbed, rendered it no less obligatory on him to make the sacrifice. Nor can any right-thinking person suppose that his request, or even his demand, to have his name left out of the only authorized "List of the Clergy" of the Diocese, is a sufficient reason for an officer of the Convention to omit it. Its publication should remain as the official declaration of the injury inflicted on a great and growing Diocese, by the unjust and cruel sentence of "indefinite suspension," under which Bishop Onderdonk is still suffering. Instead of quietly leaving his name out of the Journal, either by request or, as we fear, through design, every Churchman should fervently pray and earnestly work for his restoration to the functions of his holy office; for, surely the Diocese of New-York, more than any other in the American Church, needs the energetic supervision and governing capacity so signally centring in Bishop Onderdonk as a presiding officer and managing Head.

[From *The Churchman*, January 17, 1861.]

On referring to the Proceedings of the Convention of the Diocese of New-York, we find that not only has the name of Bishop Onderdonk been left out of the official list of the clergy in the Journals published within the last two or three years, but that it has been omitted ever since his suspension from the duties of his office. The Journals of the Diocese of New-York are, therefore, at variance with those of the General Convention; this last-mentioned body having printed his name in 1847 in the official list of the clergy, as *the* Bishop of the Diocese of New-York, with the addition of the word *suspended*. It may be supposed, however, by some, that, as there was no acting Bishop of New-York at that time, to furnish the list of clergy, required by Canon I. of 1834, the Secretary of the General Convention was obliged to "copy from the Journal of the last Diocesan Convention," and that in this way, the name of Bishop Onderdonk came to be included in the list. This could not have been the case, however, as the preceding Diocesan Journal did not contain the Bishop's name. Its insertion, therefore, in the Journal of the General Convention, must resolve itself into a *principle*, involving the rights of the Bishop and the interests of the Church at large. Nor would any other view explain the fact that, at the succeeding General Convention in 1850, the "Episcopal Acts" performed at the request of the Standing Committee are credited, in a "Tabular View," to Bishop Onderdonk personally, as performed *for* him by his brother Bishops. Neither would it explain the additional record in the "Report on the State of the Church," in the same Journal, that "there are in the Diocese of New York, *the* Bishop and 264 clergy." And not a whit less puzzling, on any other hypothesis, is the statement in the next Journal of the General Convention, that "there are *two* Bishops in the Diocese of New York." Nor would the plea of any such thing as an accidental insertion of Bishop Onderdonk's name in the Journal of the General Convention, explain the still more remarkable fact, that the Episcopal Acts of the Provisional Bishop himself are credited in the same Journal to Bishop Onderdonk, as if performed *for* him, the same as mentioned above in regard to other acting Bishops. Passing on to the following and last Journal of the General Convention, we find the name of Bishop Onderdonk properly entered as the third in the order of consecration, among the present Bishops of the American Church. But, unfortunately for the

Bishop, in the Tabular View of Episcopal Acts presented in this Journal as performed by the Provisional Bishop, the name of the Bishop of New-York is omitted!

But, perhaps, we should not censure the Secretary for thus selecting, for exclusion, the name of Bishop Onderdonk. He probably supposed that the name of a suspended Bishop was of less importance than any other in the Journal. Yet we cannot but hope that a little reflection will satisfy him that such is not the fact. On the whole, we have but little cause for complaint against the Journals of the General Convention. It is true that Bishop Onderdonk's name does not occur in the list of the clergy, published in the Journals of that body *after* the session of 1847, the Diocesan Convention of 1848 having authorized the Standing Committee to perform certain official acts, which they did—embracing the preparation of the list—until the election of a Provisional Bishop in 1852, on whom this duty subsequently devolved. Nevertheless, the name of the suspended Bishop of New-York, is otherwise conspicuous in all these important Journals. Indeed, we may find in another part of this same Journal of 1859, which has excluded his name from its former position of joint occupancy with that of Bishop Potter, that where the statistics require the number of Bishops in New-York to be designated, the "Tabular View" says "two." Still the name of the Bishop of New-York has been left out of the Table of Episcopal Acts, and Bishop Potter now stands forth as the sole authority for the performance of such acts—so that, for anything which appears in this Table, it may be inferred that he is the only Bishop connected with the Diocese of New-York.

Respecting the Diocesan Canon of 1834, from which the Provisional Bishop and others are supposed to have derived their authority for leaving out Bishop Onderdonk's name from the list of the clergy presented to the Convention, we have only to remark, that no one can suppose that it was ever intended to meet the case of the suspension of the Bishop himself, who is therein designated as the sole person capable of preparing and presenting such list. It is only by taking the utmost advantage of the merest technicality, that the terms of the Canon in question can be made applicable to Bishop Onderdonk—a suspended Bishop, with full jurisdiction, and the acknowledged head of the Diocese—so that his name might, with propriety, be erased from the official list of the clergy.

This forced construction of the Canon is simply ridiculous, and those who feel obliged to be governed by its vagueness, should take the earliest opportunity to obtain from the Convention of this Diocese an intelligent and reliable construction. Should this body construe the Canon to meet the necessities of the past, there can be no doubt whatever, in the minds of all who duly appreciate the question, that the Convention would then promptly provide for the future insertion of the Bishop's name, in the official list of the clergy. We have spoken strongly, because we deem it a matter of no slight importance to the Church that the names of Bishops Onderdonk and Potter—the Bishop and the Provisional Bishop—should each occupy its relative position in the Journals of the Convention, and because we have been greatly annoyed and pained at the bitterness of the animosity exhibited by these persevering efforts to blot out even the name of an aged and exemplary prelate, from the records of the Church—conduct the more annoying because he happens to be under discipline, and, therefore, in a defenceless position.

We cannot but conclude, after an impartial review of this matter, that the irregularities, omissions, and encroachments, attending the printing of the names of Bishop Onderdonk and the Provisional Bishop in the Journals of the Church, are governed less by Canonical regulations than by the

rancor of that personal hatred and ill-will which so industriously circulated the slanders that led to his presentment and trial, and which have so unscrupulously followed him through the whole period of his illegal and cruel sentence—a sentence which the General Convention itself has declared shall never again be inflicted on an “erring brother” of the House of Bishops, but which the majority of that body has not yet had the magnanimity to remove, or modify, in accordance with such declaration. If, as indicated by the result of successive applications for relief, Bishop Onderdonk is not soon to be actively engaged in the exercise of his Episcopal duties, let us at least hope that his name will at once be restored to the position which it should, of right, occupy, at the head of the List of the Clergy of the Diocese of New-York.

BISHOP ONDERDONK REASSERTS HIS ENTIRE INNOCENCE ON HIS DEATHBED.

The following is the letter from the Rev. Dr. Vinton to the Rev. Dr. Seabury, respecting the last illness of Bishop Onderdonk. We commend it to the special notice of those Bishops who have so unreasonably assailed the deceased prelate, because he would not confess that he was guilty of crimes of which he was innocent :

TRINITY CHURCH, NEW-YORK, }
 May 10th, 1861, }

My Dear Sir—I have been requested to write the statement which I made at the funeral of the late Bishop of New-York, and from the pulpit of Trinity Church. I add also a few particulars.

On Friday, April 26th, I called on Bishop Onderdonk and went up stairs to visit him on his sick bed. His son was in the room, ministering his nursing care with tenderness, with whom it was my privilege to co-operate.

The Bishop, though very weak in body, was fully possessed of his mind, and conversed quite freely. Among the subjects of communication he spoke with ardent satisfaction of the visit just received from the venerable Professor Clement C. Moore, whom “he had not seen,” he said, “for fourteen years.” He estimated his age and spoke of his virtues and amenity of disposition.

When about to leave him, I suggested that if he desired prayers, it would be gratifying to me to minister to him.

He answered, “Do, so, Doctor; it would be very comforting and desirable.”

I used the “Office of the Visitation of the Sick,” from the beginning to the end; adding the prayer for “A sick person, when there appeareth but little hope of recovery.”

The Bishop made every response audibly, while lying on his bed, with his hands clasped and eyes looking up to heaven.

Among the questions to be asked in the “Examination of the Sick,” are these: “Do you repent you truly of your sins? Are you in charity with all the world?” The Bishop closed his eyes while he spoke of himself as a sinner, both in thought, word, and deed; saying that, “in his most earnest endeavors to live for Christ and the Church, as well as in exercising himself to have a conscience void of offence toward God and towards man, he saw infirmity and pollution”—then, opening his eyes, he added, “But the holiest man, equally with the most sinful, finds, in the hour of death,

that every hope on which he relies for salvation is dispersed, but ONE—*all but ONE, our Saviour JESUS CHRIST—He is the Rock of Ages.*” Then, looking me in the face, the Bishop said, with solemn earnestness, “*Of the crimes of which I have been accused, and for which I have been condemned, my conscience acquits me, in the sight of God.*”

In answer to the other questions, the Bishop expressed charity with all ; forgiveness, from the bottom of his heart, of all persons that had offended him ; readiness to ask forgiveness of all whom he had offended ; and willingness to make amends, to the uttermost of his power, where he had done injury to any.

The Bishop received the final invocation and blessing, in the Visitation Office, with the meekness of a quiet spirit—then extending to me his emaciated hand and pressing mine, thanked me, with fervor, and said, “God bless you, my dear Doctor.”

And so we parted.

Very truly your brother,

FRANCIS VINTON.

To the Rev. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.

S E R M O N

PREACHED AT THE FUNERAL OF THE
RIGHT REVEREND BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D.,
BY REV. SAMUEL SEABURY, D. D.,
RECTOR OF THE CHURCH OF THE ANNUNCIATION, NEW YORK.

THE following discourse, intended only for parochial use, was delivered in the Church of the Annunciation on the Sunday following Bishop Onderdonk's death ; and was repeated, with slight alterations, when at the request of his family and a number of his clergy, and with the sanction of the Bishop of the Diocese, it became the duty of the author to preach at his funeral in Trinity church. It is now published at the request of the bishops and clergy who heard it, and in compliance with the following Resolution which the Vestry of Trinity Church, with characteristic liberality and with a laudable desire to honor the memory of their departed Bishop, adopted and ordered on their minutes :

Resolved, That a copy of the sermon on the death of the late Bishop Onderdonk be requested of Dr. Seabury for publication, and that one thousand copies be published for gratuitous distribution, and the expenses attending the same be paid by the comptroller.

A true copy.

[Signed]

G. M. OGDEN, Clerk.

The relation in which Bishop Onderdonk was placed to the Church by the action of his Episcopal colleagues and in which he was allowed to remain till the day of his death, gives significance to the fact (which under other circumstances would be hardly worthy of note) that his funeral was the most imposing demonstration of respect and affection ever rendered to the memory of a Bishop in our Church. Several hundreds of the clergy from this and the neighboring Dioceses, many of them at great personal inconvenience, were present ; and hundreds of laymen, some of whom had come for the purpose from distant parts of the State, sought in vain to gain admission into the church. An eloquent description of the funeral, taken from *The Church Journal*, will be found in an appendix to the discourse.* In this description are inserted the Resolutions of the clergy of the Diocese and of its Standing Committee, and annexed to it are those of the Faculty of the General Theological Seminary ; in which the Bishop retained his professorship to the day of his death, though debarred for many years past from inculcating on its students those sound views of the nature, ministry, and polity of the Church which he was known to entertain.

Next to the comfort inspired by the approbation of God and one's own

* The article from *The Church Journal* is printed in a previous page of this pamphlet.

conscience, is that which is derived from the approbation of good men. It was the privilege of the deceased, if charity indeed may be allowed to draw from his words and actions a favorable judgment of his heart, to enjoy the former in no common degree; and few men more ingenuously coveted the latter when it could be honorably obtained, or smarted more poignantly under the want of it when it was unjustly withheld, or cruelly and capriciously withdrawn. I shall not violate in this brief note the reserve I have imposed on myself in the discourse which follows it: but thus much I may say; that the good opinion of those of his own Communion, and especially of his Diocese, who, from the beginning of his troubles, confided in his integrity, or who were afterwards won over to respect him by the silent eloquence of his sufferings; and of the many others, in distant places and different communions, who were bound to him only by the ties of a common humanity and religion, and by that reverence for the safeguards of reputation which humanity and religion ought to inspire, was, next to the testimony of his conscience and the hope of again serving God in the duties of his ministry, the light of his darkness, and the solace of his sorrow. This assurance is due to all who extended to him, during the bitterness of his humiliation, just and generous thoughts, or spoke in his behalf kind and fearless words; offerings of small account with the world, but noted and treasured up by Him who has promised that *a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple shall not lose its reward*. The extent of this sympathy with the deceased, and the hold which he really had on the hearts of his clergy and people, were indeed unknown to him in life, and only revealed in all their depth and fulness after his death: but it is all right; nor should we wish to change what Divine Providence has ordered; remembering that "men see the end of the wise and understand not what God in His counsel hath decreed of him, and to what end the Lord hath set him at rest."

S. S.

New York, Whitsun-tide, A. D. 1861.

DISCOURSE.

“He was a burning and a shining light, and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.”—*John v. 35.*

WHEN our Blessed Lord had wrought one of His miraculous cures, the Jews persecuted and sought to kill Him, because He had done it on the Sabbath day. Jesus replied: “My Father worketh hitherto and I work,” thus intimating to them that though there had been a rest from the work of creation (which the Sabbath commemorated), there had yet been no rest from the work of Providence; and that the miracle He had wrought was only a continuance of that goodness and wisdom which He in unity with His Father had always exercised in the government of the world. The Jews then sought the more to kill Him, because He had not only broken the Sabbath, but had said also that God was His Father, in such sense as to make Himself equal with God. Our Lord embraced the occasion to declare to them more fully the nature of His office and mission, assuring them that His authority over mankind was not limited to this life; that He would be their Judge hereafter; and that in order to the consummation of His plans, all that were in their graves would arise; they that had done good to the resurrection of life, and they that had done evil to the resurrection of damnation.*

That none might reject Him for want of sufficient testimony our Lord then declared to the Jews, that He did not rest the proof of His authority on His own word alone, but on other grounds: His miraculous works, the types and prophecies of the Scriptures, and the voice from Heaven of the Father publicly acknowledging and proclaiming Him to be His Son. There was another proof of less consequence indeed, but one which those whom He addressed had no right to reject, because they had themselves appealed to it; and that was the testimony of John the Baptist. “Ye sent unto John,” He said, “and he bare witness unto the truth” that I am the Messiah; and though I need not this testimony from man, yet I insist on it for your sakes that ye may be saved. “He was a burning and a shining light, and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.” Ye owned him for a just man and a prophet;

* The introductory paragraph, and a few passages in the body of the discourse, not essential to the connection of thought, were omitted in the delivery.

while he lived he testified of Me ; do not therefore reject his testimony now that he is dead ; but consider and lay it to heart that it may work in you that faith by which you may be saved.

He was a burning and a shining light ; a lamp or candle as the original word signifies, and as the English word *light* often means ; a lamp kindled at the fountain of Light and diffusing the radiance of Him who revealed Himself as the light of the world. Or to express the same idea without the metaphor, we may say that St. John the Baptist bore, during his whole life, a distinct and impressive testimony to the truth and heavenly origin of the doctrine that Jesus Christ is the Son of God and the Saviour of mankind.

This testimony of St. John the Baptist consisted both in what he did and in what he suffered for the religion of Jesus Christ. During part of his life he bore testimony to Christ in the active duties of his ministry ; and when his boldness in preaching repentance, and rebuking vice, had provoked the malice of implacable enemies and led to his imprisonment, he then continued to bear witness to the truth in a life of retirement from the world and of suffering for his Master's sake.

The words which our Lord applied to the Holy Baptist, have been often applied, in a qualified sense, to the ministers of God and other Christians, who in their several generations, have been lights of the world. All such, while strength and opportunity were given, have served God in the active duties of their several vocations ; and when debarred from these they have continued to serve Him in the passive duties of resignation and submission to His blessed will. From Christ the light which enlivened their labors and sufferings is derived ; for Christ the light of their example is manifested to the world. However eminent or however humble their station in the Church, their life, if they sincerely believe and practice the Christian faith, is a testimony for Christ ; a light to the generation in which they live, burning and shining in proportion to the sincerity of their faith, and the vigor of their charity.

The life of the venerable Bishop who has recently been taken from among us, like that of every good Christian, has been a testimony to the truth and efficacy of the religion of Jesus Christ. But unlike that of most others his life has been divided into two distinct portions ; the one marked chiefly by resolute action, the other exclusively by patient suffering. He is now beyond the reach of human praise : and I need not tell you that the object of a funeral commemoration is not to eulogize the dead but to benefit the living. Such honor as is due to the departed and as serves to promote this end, it is meet and right for us to render. Such praise and commendation as would defeat this end, and stir up the smouldering em-

bers of strife and jealousy, even though justly due, it were needless to utter and better to restrain. Guided by this principle, which I know would not only be sanctioned but imperatively enjoined on me by our departed father were he to direct my speech, I ask your attention on this occasion, to a brief review of his life ; his acts and sufferings for the sake of Christ ; in the simple desire to promote the Christian edification of us, the clergy and people who were committed to his charge. The tie which bound us to our Bishop was never wholly severed until it was severed by death ; on his part it was always, even to his latest breath, tenderly and affectionately cherished ; and its providential continuance, long after he was restrained from the active duties of his ministry, if it do not increase, will not, it may be hoped, diminish the influence which the example of his virtues ought to have upon our hearts and lives.

His father, a much respected physician of this city, his mother, a woman remarkable for strength of character, dignity of deportment, and Christian virtue ; both communicants of the Church, and of high social position, it was the happiness of Bishop Onderdonk to be devoted to God in infancy, and to be brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Distinguished in childhood by piety and devotion, by sincerity and truthfulness, and by a sobriety and gravity above his years, he did but fulfil the expectations of all who knew him, when on leaving college he set himself, in dependence on the grace of God, to prepare for the duties of the Holy Ministry. The foundation which he laid and fortified at this time was the same on which he ever afterwards stood. The fall of man by sin ; his redemption by the voluntary humiliation and sacrifice of the Son of God to the capacity of pardon and eternal life ; and the establishment of the Church of Christ on earth as the means of preserving the true religion, and of deriving from its Head in Heaven that spiritual influence which is necessary to open to men an access to the Father through the Son and by the Holy Spirit on the prescribed conditions of the Gospel covenant ; these were the principles, on which indeed his youthful character had been formed, but which in his preparation for the Holy Ministry, under the supervision of one of the brightest luminaries of the Church, became distinctly defined to his consciousness, and intimately wrought with all the fibres of his mind and heart. From these principles he never swerved ; in all that he taught and did for the sake of Christ, they were his constant guide ; in all that he suffered for the same cause they were his unfailing support. His discourses, both oral and published, were an expansion of these principles ; his government of his diocese, and his agency in the general councils of the Church were an application of

these principles; and his patient submission to her discipline was the legitimate fruit of these principles. His whole life, so far as it was devoted to Christ at all, was a consistent development of the one grand truth that the institution of the Church on earth, with its ministry and sacraments, in dependence on and communion with its Head in Heaven, is the divinely appointed and only authorized means of recovering mankind by repentance and faith in the second Adam, from that state of utter ruin in which they were involved by the apostacy of the first Adam.

Admitted in the twenty-second year of his life to the Holy Order of Deacon, he was soon afterwards chosen an assistant minister of Trinity church. On attaining the canonical age he was ordained priest at Newark, N. J., in company with his fast friend, the late Dr. Bayard; the ordination being held by Bishop Hobart, who had also admitted him to the Diaconate.

My personal knowledge of our departed Bishop began soon after this time; and though then a child, I still remember with gratitude the pious and affectionate counsel which I received from him. From that time to the present I have known him as well and as intimately as it is often permitted one man to know another; and I have no hesitation in saying that in all the freedom of private intercourse, I have never heard from him a word which might not have been uttered before the angels of Heaven, or which he will, in my opinion, wish unsaid at the day of judgment. I mean by this to affirm that in all my intercourse with him the strictest moral purity has governed his words, and as far as I could see, his thoughts and affections.

During his connection with Trinity church, or at least until his consecration to the Episcopate, Bishop Onderdonk was chiefly distinguished for his fidelity as a Parish Priest. His labors in visiting the people committed to his charge, particularly the poor, the sick and afflicted, and in instructing the young, were systematic and assiduous; and won for him great commendation.*

In the pulpit, Dr. Onderdonk was at that time overshadowed, in popular estimation, by the more brilliant, animated and

* In reference to this point it cannot be deemed inappropriate to introduce the following testimony from the venerable Rector of Trinity Church:

"In 1836, the Episcopal Fund having reached the point which was deemed requisite for the support of the Bishop of the Diocese, Bishop Onderdonk's connection with Trinity Church was consequently dissolved. The deep humiliation to which he has since been reduced, and the obloquy, the scorn, and contempt with which he has been loaded, will not prevent me from exhibiting him as he was in the estimation of his friends and in his relation to this Parish.

"I had been at that time in habits of the closest and dearest intimacy with him for thirty years. I became acquainted with him at college in early life, he was my fellow student in Divinity, and as soon as he was ordained, he was associated with me in the same Parish, from opening manhood till he had considerably passed the period of middle age. From our common duties and our mutual regard, we were brought into constant intercourse with each

persuasive eloquence of Bishop Hobart. His pulpit discourses, however, were always acknowledged to be sound, judicious and instructive; nor were they ever wanting in those earnest and pathetic appeals which are designed to awaken the conscience of the hearer, and to impress on him the distinctive truths of the Christian Faith in connection with its awful sanctions, and under a deep sense of personal responsibility.

Bishop Hobart was called to administer the affairs of this diocese at a time when, owing to the laxity in doctrine of one of his predecessors and the amiable forbearance of the other, the real nature of the Christian Church, as a society divinely appointed for the preservation of the true religion and the salvation of mankind, was very imperfectly understood. The intrepidity and learning with which he avowed and inculcated the true principles of the Church; the piety and eloquence with which he recommended them; the measures which he originated in his diocese for giving them practical operation

other, so that all his infirmities and faults, as well as his virtues and graces, were laid open before me.

"In his very youth he was grave, sedate, and thoughtful, to a degree which is seldom seen; correct in his principles; pure in heart, and unspotted in life. In his academic pursuits and in his preparation for the ministry, he was so unwearied in his diligence and so laudable in his ambition as to have distinguished himself greatly in both. And when he at length entered upon the exercise of his office, it was with such a devout temper of mind, such a conscientious view of his duties, and such a fixed determination to discharge them as within the range of my observation, at least, has never been surpassed. These duties, in the very outset of his course in this extensive Parish, were exceedingly heavy. But he never shrunk from any labor, he never tired in his own work, nor hesitated in an emergency to help his brethren.

"He had at once the physical strength which enabled him to bear the utmost degree of labor, and the ready will to perform it with cheerfulness.

"But he was not only indefatigable in the performance of his public duties, but most assiduous and faithful as a pastor, going about continually doing good, and especially among the sick and the needy, the afflicted and distressed.

"This pastoral attention to the members of the Parish, was a duty to which I had always attached the greatest importance myself, and which, according to my ability, I had endeavored to discharge. I was constantly among the people, where he was held in the utmost respect and affection, and where, until several years after his entrance into the Episcopate, the breath of reproach had never reached him.

"They are witnesses with me how holily and unblamably he behaved himself among us. I doubt not that 'we may depart from grace given,' yet still I have great confidence in the general truth of that promise of God, 'The Lord ordereth a good man's going and maketh his way acceptable to Himself.' And I can never be brought to believe, except on more convincing testimony than I have yet met with, that one, who in early life and in ripper years delighted in His ways, and who so highly adorned the vocation where-with he was called, has fallen into such 'wretchedness of living' as is ascribed to him, on the very verge of old age."—[*Historical Sketch of Trinity Church, New York, by the Rev. William Berrian, D.D., the Rector of the same,* pp. 313-15.

and effect; the occasions which occurred, in the Providence of God, for their enunciation and defence; the courage, promptitude, and ability with which he met these occasions and turned them to the advancement of the great end and object of his life; the controversies which were thus awakened and the hostility which was provoked; all this is well known to those (and it startles me to think how few they have now become!) whose memory reaches back to those times. Dr. Onderdonk, from the steadiness of his judgment, and from the studies to which his mind, in a manner quite independent of Bishop Hobart, had in early life been providentially directed,* was eminently fitted, in every trial and peril of the faith, to help his spiritual father, and to ward off the shafts which were aimed at him. Nor was he ever backward in the discharge of this duty. The press as well as the pulpit attested his ability; and the pamphlets which he put forth, in defence of his Bishop, with and without his name, were highly satisfactory to his friends, and conceded by all to be able and dignified. The sermons, too, which he published on several important occasions added to his reputation as a sound and able divine. His stated and occasional contributions also to periodical journals, through the whole of his ministry, were of immense service in diffusing a just knowledge of the Church, and creating a healthy and conservative tone of piety among her members. He was indeed a divine lamp, illuminating the hearts of the faithful with the true light of Holy Writ.† Essays on the institutions and usages of the Church, opinions that will have the weight of authority on her rubrics and canons, and expositions of her doctrines, designed to exhibit their scriptural warrant, and their practical and devotional efficacy (and volumes of these fugitive publications might be collected), are

* He once told me that about the time he began his theological studies, a clergyman from the South, then sojourning in New York, called on him and requested him to purchase a few volumes which necessity obliged him to part with; that he purchased them to relieve the wants of the applicant, and without at the time any knowledge of the character of the books and their authors. The books were Johnson's *Unbloody Sacrifice*, Hickes's *Christian Priesthood*, and others of like character. These, he said, he carefully studied; and no one familiar with his writings can doubt that they had great influence in forming his theological opinions.

† "Wherefore the persecution being at present somewhat abated, he rejoiced greatly at the tranquillity of his Church; yet was troubled as to himself that he had not attained to a true love of Christ, nor was come up to the pitch of a perfect disciple. For he thought that the confession which is made by martyrdom, would bring him to a yet more close and intimate union with the Lord. Wherefore continuing a few years longer with the Church, and after the manner of a divine lamp, illuminating the hearts of the faithful by the exposition of the Holy Scriptures, he attained to what he desired."—*Relation of the Martyrdom of St. Ignacius*, Archbishop Wake's translation.

proofs of a zeal and ability in the cause of Christ and His Church, which have been rarely equalled.

At the time of which I speak the cause of the Church was exceedingly unpopular. It was impossible to stand up fully to her principles without forfeiting reputation for liberality of sentiment and evangelical piety, and incurring the imputations of intolerance and bigotry, and of spiritual blindness and apathy. The desolation and distractions which were afterwards produced in this State by what were called revivals of religion, and the remarkable movement which began about the same time in favor of Church principles and usages, and of a piety, steady, substantial and unobtrusive, in place of that which was fitful, erratic and demonstrative, have had the effect to raise the character of the Church in public estimation. But in the days of Bishop Hobart, it was some trial of a man's courage to avow principles which he has now no temptation to conceal. In times like these, Dr. Onderdonk was inflexible; firm as an anvil* under the strokes of heresy and schism. He gave his Bishop, both in public and private, no evasive and shuffling support. He was never charged with being a time-server, nor with diluting his principles to suit the popular taste. He was never charged with indiscreet or intemperate zeal in the advocacy of his principles. The only charges brought against him were the stale ones of bigotry, narrow-mindedness and servility to his Bishop; and the contempt implied in such reproaches, he estimated at its true value: desiring no higher honor of the world than to be counted a bigot in an heretical and degenerate age.

On the death of Bishop Hobart, in 1830, Dr. Onderdonk was universally regarded as the man best adapted to administer the Diocese on the principles which Bishop Hobart had so fearlessly inculcated. He was accordingly chosen, with a good degree of unanimity, to become its Bishop, and was in due time consecrated to that exalted office. To the neglect of his worldly affairs and the sacrifice of domestic comfort, and with a generous and guileless confidence in the affections of his people, he devoted himself anew to the Church of the Redeemer. He concurred in all general and authorized measures for its advancement, but sought especially, after the example of his predecessor, to give efficiency to the several societies of the Diocese; not merely because they were Diocesan institutions, but because they concede less than those of a more general nature† to the spirit of the age and are more rigidly

* Στήφι ἰδραῖος ὡς ἄκμων τυπτόμενος.—Sti. Ignatii ad Sym. Polycarpum Epistola, Cap. iii.

† No allusion is here made to the associations, outside of the Church, which are designed to combine in the dissemination of religious knowledge all those

adapted to disseminate the Word of God in connection with the Church of God. In all parts of the Diocese, which during a portion of his Episcopate was coterminous with the entire State, his appointments were numerous and punctually fulfilled; and his services, especially his discourses from the pulpit, were highly acceptable and satisfactory. His annual addresses to the Convention of his Diocese, while they prove the extent of his labors, abound with suggestions of practical wisdom; while his charges and occasional papers, brought out by remarkable events, are eminently worthy of their place in the archives of the Church.

It was some eight or ten years after his induction into the Episcopate when the extraordinary impulse which had been given to Church principles in England began to be felt in this country. By Church principles I mean, as I have explained, those principles which represent the Church of Christ to be not merely a national establishment, nor yet a Christian asso-

who, whatever be their other differences of opinion, agree in a profession of faith in the Holy Scriptures. With these associations, how much soever he might respect the individuals that compose them, it was impossible for Bishop Onderdonk to unite, inasmuch as the principle on which they are founded is antagonistic to that which had been the guide of his professional life; and which supposes the Church of Christ to be divinely instituted and perpetuated in order to preserve the Holy Scriptures, not only in their letter, but in their true sense and meaning; to guard them from the perversions of error, and to witness to each successive generation the true faith and doctrine which they contain. [See this principle, as distinguished from the infallibility of the existing Church on the one hand and latitudinarianism on the other, very ably elucidated by Bishop Onderdonk in his primary charge to the clergy of his Diocese, A. D. 1831.]

By *institutions of a more general nature* I mean those "authorized measures," which are mentioned just before, and which are designed to unite Churchmen of different shades of opinion in the diffusion of religious knowledge. These as well as our Diocesan societies are formed on the principle of responsibility to the constituted authorities of the Church; the difference being that they are held responsible to the General Convention and not to the ecclesiastical authority of a particular diocese. Bishop Onderdonk coöperated with the former and helped to give them a conservative direction and influence; but he sought especially to give efficiency to the latter, not from local feeling or a desire of personal distinction (of which motives he was incapable), but because, in the existing state of opinions and parties, he believed them to be his best auxiliary for diffusing the Gospel without depressing the ministry and sacraments of the Church on which the Gospel rests for support. He was proud of the Diocese of New York, not for its wealth, its numbers, or its relative position, but because of its distinct testimony and steadfast adherence to those principles of the nature and polity of the Christian Church which had been inculcated by his predecessor, and which were regarded by himself as part of the "sacred deposit" committed to his trust.

This note which is meant to be merely explanatory, is offered with a view to guard against misapprehension on the part of those Christian brethren who, as they do not belong to our Communion, may be supposed without offence to be unacquainted with its distinctive features.

ciation formed by pious and learned men for the diffusion of the Scriptures and for the promotion of a holy life agreeably to the Scriptures ; but an orderly and visible society of heavenly nature and origin ; planted on earth by Christ himself ; propagated, by laws which Christ had given, to later ages and distant countries so as never to lose its identity and union with its divine Head ; appointed by God himself to preserve and transmit true religion and to be the means to the latest times of recovering fallen man from his apostacy and of restoring him by the energy of the Holy Spirit, on his repentance and faith in Christ our only Saviour, to the communion of the Blessed. These principles were at that time wonderfully resuscitated ; and they were eloquently and vigorously proclaimed, though in connection, it must be admitted, with opinions and usages of doubtful or pernicious tendency. The heavenly seed was plentifully scattered ; but with the wheat, tares and weeds sprang up, as they are wont, from the soil of our degenerate nature. As an inevitable result the Church, especially in this Diocese, was shaken with the winds of controversy. On the one side the principles were vigorously maintained in despite of the errors that were mixed with them ; on the other side the errors were assailed for the very purpose of stifling the principles which they encumbered and deformed. Of these principles Bishop Onderdonk showed himself at this time, what indeed he had always been, the uncompromising advocate. Applying his favorite canon of antiquity, universality, and consent, explained and inculcated by him, after the example of Vincentius Lirinensis in a discourse published years before the Oxford movement was heard of in this country, he discriminated the opinions and usages ; commending those which stood the test of the canon of Vincentius, and repudiating and condemning without stint those which were of later growth. In his own Diocese he was sustained with enthusiasm by a very large majority of the clergy and a majority of the laity. To true Churchmen throughout all the Dioceses of the Union, and by true Churchmen I mean those who adhered to the principles I have defined, his name was a tower of strength ; while to all others, the Bishop of the Diocese of New York was a stumbling block and a rock of offence.

In October, 1844, Bishop Onderdonk was at the zenith of his fame ; surrounded by a body of clergy who admired his courage and firmness, and to whom he was at that moment especially endeared by the noble stand he had taken in the Convention of the week previous, in behalf of the Liturgy of the Church, and in opposition to the changes which were then beginning to be advocated in order to bring it down to the

level of the times.* At the expiration of two months after this, our Bishop was BURIED ALIVE: accused by the Bishops of three remote Dioceses before a court of their order, and by that court suspended from the exercise of his ministry and from the office of a Bishop in the Church of God. I leave therefore the active portion of his life with the simple remark, that the feeble outline I have given of his services, but for the event which arrested his active career, and which fell upon the Church like a thunder clap in a clear sky, would have eminently justified the application of the text: "He was a burning and a shining light, and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light." Now as then, it can be no harm, I hope, to recount his services and to rejoice in them, so that our joy

* Towards the conclusion of Bishop Onderdonk's Address to the Convention of his Diocese, A. D. 1844, pp. 96 and 97 of the Journal, occurs the following passage:

"I have now, my brethren, completed all I have to report of a statistical nature. I have not much else to add. Something, however, I must, in reference to a new development which seems to have taken place in the quarter whence, within a few years, anxiety has been given, though no serious fears have been occasioned, to the true friends of Christ and the Church. Throughout much of the agitation which has existed in the Catholic portion of the Christians of our country, the CHURCH AS IT IS has been the motto adopted by all. To many this seemed strange indeed, convinced as they were that THE CHURCH AS IT IS was anything but favorable to much of the agitation which has been going on. It now begins to appear that they were right. The truer and more sensible ground is taken that the Church as it is *will not answer*. The Liturgy is beginning to be disparaged as a standard of Faith. Changes in the Liturgy are beginning to be advocated as necessary *to bring it down to the times*. This too, not by open enemies; but professed companions and friends—from quarters whence '*the Church as it is*' was lately heard as all that was wanted.

"I am not surprised at this. Nor do I regret it. It is the beginning of that *righteous balancing* by which He who is Head over all things unto His Church makes all things ultimately work together for good. The true issue is now beginning to be known. IT IS THE PRAYER BOOK—FOR IT OR AGAINST IT. Brethren, you know on which side I would have my Diocese enlisted. GO FOR THE LITURGY. It is the great exponent of our faith. It is the work of no sect-leader. It is the work of no one man, however good and holy. It is the work of no one age. It was got up and set forth for no one special purpose. It has come down to us from the purest ages of the Church. It has been *proved* by the safety and purity with which it passed through the trying fires of Rome's wicked hostility to the Catholic evangelical system.

"I exhort you therefore, brethren, to a cordial, enlightened, and strict adherence to the Liturgy. Be, as ye ever have been, jealous, with a godly jealousy of every system and every act, which tend to diminish confidence in that pure and holy standard of our faith. That confidence there is now an effort to shake. Take ye good heed that ye be not thus turned from your steadfastness.

"Brethren of the clergy: I would especially commend to your enlightened confidence, and your pious adoption as a rule and measure of ministerial fidelity, our Liturgy's holy teachings—as God's Word hath taught it—touching the sacramental character of the evangelical system, and the Apostolical succession of ministerial trust and agency which it embraces. 1

in his virtues lead us to imitate them, and to serve and glorify Him from Whom alone all Christian virtues proceed.

In passing to the other portion of Bishop Onderdonk's life, I must be permitted to call your attention to two facts. The first is that the verdict of the court that tried him, was not unanimous, six of the Bishops wholly exonerating him from the charges of which the majority convicted him. The other is that although suspended by the court from the Holy Ministry on the charge of immorality and impurity, he was not suspended from the Holy Communion. On the contrary, he was permitted to live, and did live from his suspension to the day of his death, in the Communion of that very Church, and consequently in the Communion of those very Bishops, who had deprived the Diocese of New York of his services, and banished him from the General Councils of the Church. I do not impeach the consistency of his judges; they kept in this respect within the limits of the canon; I merely wish the fact to be noted, that though in the declared judgment of the Church he was unworthy of the Holy Ministry; yet with the full knowledge and implied approbation of the Church he was at once, publicly and with express Episcopal sanction,* ac-

would have you reverently receive its teachings respecting the awful mysteries of our faith: be they in doctrine touching the nature of the Holy and Undivided Trinity Whom it leads us to adore, and His gracious acts and dispensations towards our race; or be they included in the homage and duties required in our devotion to Him. I would that in your teachings you would impress upon your people the near relation to them of *the Church as it is*, in reference to their steadfast adherence to the true faith, their safety from being driven about by every wind of doctrine, and their repose under the shadow of the great rock which the Gospel provides in the weary land of life's pilgrimage.

"To these ends, dear brethren, as means at hand, worthy of your regard, and eminently fitted for efficiency towards the desired object, let me commend to your greatly increased patronage our diocesan agencies for disseminating the Word of God and the Holy Liturgy of the Church, for circulating sound and good religious tracts, for educating young men for the ministry, and for sustaining and encouraging missionary operations in our Diocese, in this great metropolis, and for the especial benefit of the seamen here congregating, and for good or ill to our Saviour's cause, carrying to barbarous and unchristian lands what is there regarded as a token of what Christianity is worth.

"We are much behindhand, brethren, in our duty in these respects. I would I could make you feel it! Can the love of Christ constrain you as it should constrain those whose hearts are truly moved by the Holy Ghost, while you suffer these instrumentalities and agencies for good, which God by His Holy Church has laid before you, to be so sorely let and hindered in their blessed efficiency? Answer this, brethren, as members of Christ, children of God, and heirs of a kingdom which will be conferred on none but good and faithful servants, those who turn their Lord's talents to the account which He requires—those who are willing to give, and glad to distribute, and are mainly devoted to laying up for themselves treasures in Heaven."

* The Communion was administered to him, the first Sunday after his suspension, in his parish church, by the late venerable Bp. Gadsden, of South Carolina.

counted, and to the day of his death continued to be accounted worthy of the Holy Communion.*

In anguish of soul, but with characteristic promptitude, our Bishop at once marked out for himself the road he was to travel in the bleak and inhospitable region on whose coast he was wrecked. He bowed to the authority of the Church, received his sentence with humble and submissive temper, and resolved to conform to it in its spirit as well as its letter. He not only sought no opportunity to exercise his office, but he withdrew from the world, that he might devote himself in retirement to the duties of a holy life. The treachery of professed friends, the neglect and ingratitude, the violations of decorum and charity, or what he esteemed such, he could not but deeply feel, and in some marked cases resent; but his resentment was that of sorrow, not of anger or revenge. The spirit of meekness and forgiveness dwelt in his heart, and distilled from his lips. Of his accusers and of his judges who

* The supreme legislative power of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States is lodged in the General Convention, which meets triennially, and is composed of two houses; the one consisting of Bishops having jurisdiction in the United States, and the other consisting of Clerical and Lay Deputies elected by the several Dioceses.

The first canon ever enacted by the General Convention, looking towards the trial of a bishop, was canon 4th of 1841. This canon was entitled indeed "On the Trial of Bishops" but contained not a word on the subject indicated by the title. It provided for the *presentment* of a bishop, and for nothing else. See the canon. It was expressly and wholly repealed by the next Convention, or that of 1844.

The canon under which Bishop Onderdonk was tried was enacted in October, 1844, and has been since repealed.

The alleged offences for which Bishop Onderdonk was tried, were alleged to have been committed at different times between June, 1837, and July, 1842. All of them, therefore, if committed at all, were committed before the enactment of the canon under which he was tried, and all but one before the enactment of the canon of 1841.

The presentment was made by the bishops of the dioceses of Virginia, Georgia, and Tennessee, after the refusal of his own diocese to entertain the charges that were made against him.

The canon under which Bishop Onderdonk was tried, enacts that if the accused be found guilty, the court shall "pass sentence of admonition, suspension, or deposition, as to them the offence or offences may seem to deserve."

The sentence of the court, pronounced Jan. 3, 1845, was *suspension*; and that not only "from the office of a Bishop in the Church of God," which the canon authorized, but also "from all the functions of the Sacred Ministry."

The suspension was not limited either by a term of time or condition; nor was there any power in the Church (unless the General Convention itself be considered an exception) competent to revoke it.

In the next General Convention, or that of 1847, two canons having reference to this case were enacted. The first provided that "The Bishops of this Church who are entitled to seats in the House of Bishops, may altogether remit and terminate any judicial sentence which may have been imposed, or may hereafter be imposed, by Bishops acting collectively as a judicial tribunal, or

condemned him (and from whose condemnation no appeal could be taken save to the judgment seat of God*), he uniformly spoke with all the respect and kindness that were possible for one who felt himself injured by their decision. He said all in their favor that truth would allow and charity dictate. He made no unworthy concessions, no mean compliances; though he never affected to disguise the gratification which he felt at the visits of his numerous friends, and their expressions or messages of regard and confidence. The hope that he might again be permitted to exercise the duties of his ministry was the solace of his life. All else on earth he could relinquish, but the extinction of this hope was death. To realize it he was content to make every admission which ingenuity could devise, consistent with the protestation of substantial innocence. Every repression of this hope on the part of those who had it in their power to gratify it, led him to examine more deeply the recesses of his soul, and stirred him up to new acts of self-abasement and penitence, new resolutions of watchfulness and self-control, in order that he might make himself, through God's grace, more and more fit by the arts of holy prudence and circumspection to guard against even the appearance of evil in the exercise of his ministry whensoever the good Providence of God should permit him to resume it. And when at last this hope was quenched, and he realized what he had been slow to believe, that his Master had no further work for him to do on earth, and that there was really

modify the same so far as to designate a precise period of time or other specific contingency, on the occurrence of which such sentence shall utterly cease, and be of no further force or effect." The other enacted that "Whenever the penalty of suspension shall be inflicted on a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in this Church, the sentence shall specify on what terms, or at what time, said penalty shall cease."

From this statement it will be seen that Bishop Onderdonk suffered for more than sixteen years, or from January, 1845, to the time of his death, under a sentence which the Church, at the earliest possible opportunity for doing so after it was pronounced, repudiated and forbade to be pronounced in future on any clergyman under its jurisdiction. It will be seen also that Bishop Onderdonk suffered under this sentence for nearly fourteen years, or from October, 1847, to April, 1861, after the General Convention, by empowering the bishops to remit it, had done all that a legislative body could do towards its removal.

These facts are, I believe, without a parallel in history. The mention of them can now do no good to Bishop Onderdonk, who (God be praised!) is delivered out of the miseries of this sinful world; and I should rejoice to have them consigned to eternal oblivion, were it not that the memory of the past may serve as a beacon to the Church for the future.

* The decision of the Court in Bishop Onderdonk's case was final. The Church had provided for no appeal; and an appeal from her decision to that of a civil court, though often urged on him, was steadfastly rejected as inconsistent with his sense of duty and submission to the authority of the Church.

nothing left to him but that confidence in God, of which he was always humbly resolved never to be robbed, it can be no wonder that his bodily health began visibly to decline. The refusal, after fifteen years of prayer and suffering, to permit him to exercise the Christian ministry on earth, seemed to be a summons to exchange the Bishop's mitre for the Confessor's crown, and to pass from the Church militant to the Church triumphant.

When the last effort* was made, some two years ago, to induce the Bishops of the Church to use the power vested in them by the General Convention for our Bishop's relief, the vestry of his parish church united in the movement. They sent a memorial to the House of Bishops representing to that venerable body "That Bishop Onderdonk for nearly fifteen years, or ever since his suspension, had been a member of their parish and a constant attendant of Divine Service, both on week days and Sundays. From this circumstance it has happened," they say, "that some or other members of our parish have been, during the whole of this time, in habits of daily intercourse with our Bishop, and that we its representatives, have had opportunities not possessed by others, of observing his deportment; and we have no hesitation," they added, "in bearing our unequivocal testimony to the purity and holiness of his life and conversation during the whole time of his connection with our parish. In the sanctuary, we have been impressed and edified by his humble and reverential deportment. In his social intercourse we have seen no levity in his manners, nor any evidence of impatience or discontent under his sufferings; nor have we ever heard from his lips the words of murmur or reproach. Degraded in the Providence of God to the rank of those over whom he once used to preside, he has set us a bright example of self-respect as a man, and of quiet and uncomplaining submission as a Christian; and though debarred from the exercise of his office, he has uniformly displayed the gravity and dignity that are fitted to adorn it." This testimonial was signed by all the members of the vestry; and I have read this extract because it goes to show that they who knew him best, loved and revered him most; and because also in this brief passage you have, as it were, a portrait of the man in his retirement from the world. A strenuous advocate on principle for the daily service of the Church, he was also a

* Reference is here made to the memorial which Bishop Onderdonk addressed to the House of Bishops in the General Convention of 1859. The prayer of the memorialist was supported by a resolution (qualified, it must be owned, by a condition though of little practical value), which passed the Convention of his Diocese by a vote of 147 to 19 of the clergy, and of 75 to 46 of the laity; two parishes being divided.

constant and punctual attendant on it : neither heat, nor cold, nor storm kept him from his place : beside this there is little variety of incident to recount, and the last seventeen years of his life may be briefly summed up in the words, " He departed not from the temple, but served God day and night with prayers." Sequestered from this troublesome world, he lived but to converse with God, and to meditate on that blessed place to which, we trust, he has now arrived, and on that blessed company to which, we humbly hope he is now united.*

Although the health of the Bishop had been during the Winter visibly declining, yet it was his own opinion and the opinion of those around him, that it would be in some measure renewed by the return of the genial season which renews the face of nature. He understood that the disease under which he labored would be ultimately fatal, but he looked forward, until a few days before his death, to a partial recovery. It fell to my lot to undeceive him in this respect, and to assure him that the hand of death was upon him.† He received the communication with the utmost calmness and seriousness, but with a full sense of its importance. He felt, he said, the solemnity of death, but it was an event on which his mind had been habitually fixed ; he expressed surprise that there should have been any hesitation in speaking plainly to him on the subject, and thanked me for my Christian kindness, as he was pleased to call it, in making to him the announcement. After a brief conversation, I proposed to him the reception of the Holy Communion. He seemed to have anticipated the suggestion ; spoke of it as the closing act of his life, and one which ought to be preceded by a special preparation, and promised to appoint a time for the purpose. On the Sunday following I administered to him the Blessed Sacrament in the midst of his family, all of whom, as many as were present, united with him in the participation. He received the Holy Mysteries with his accustomed evidences of earnest penitence and deep humility ; of lively faith, of fervent charity, and of sincere and unreserved forgiveness as he hoped to be forgiven. Nothing occurred to mar the quiet joy of the heavenly scene unless it were his expression of regret that, through some misunderstanding, two of his old and dear friends‡ whom he had expected were not present on the occasion.§

* See Bishop Horne's Life and Death of St. John Baptist, sect. vii.

† This interview was on the morning of Thursday, April 25th.

‡ The Rev. Dr. M'Vickar and the Rev. Dr. S. R. Johnson.

§ The following communication, which has been kindly addressed to me by the Rev. Dr. Francis Vinton, may be here properly inserted :

TRINITY CHURCH, NEW YORK, May 10th, 1861

MY DEAR SIR :—I have been requested to write the statement which I

On the following morning I visited him again, but found him, though in full possession of his mental powers, yet too weak for conversation. I may here mention that immediately before administering to him the Holy Communion I had asked him if he wished me to use in connection with the Communion Service, any part of the Office for the Visitation of the Sick. He answered, "Yes; use the prayer in which we beseech God to continue this sick member in the unity of the Church;" adding that it had always been with him a favorite prayer; "and use also," he said, "the Collect for all present at the Visitation." On this occasion, finding him as I said too weak for

made at the funeral of the late Bishop of New York, and from the pulpit of Trinity church. I add also a few particulars.

On Friday, April 26th, I called on Bishop Onderdonk, and went up stairs to visit him on his sick bed. His son was in the room, ministering his nursing care with tenderness, with whom it was my privilege to coöperate.

The Bishop, though very weak in body, was fully possessed of his mind, and conversed quite freely. Among the subjects of communication he spoke with ardent satisfaction of the visit just received from the venerable Prof. Clement C. Moore, whom he "had not seen," he said, "for fourteen years." He estimated his age, and spoke of his virtues and amenity of disposition.

When about to leave him, I suggested that if he desired prayers, it would be gratifying to me to minister to him.

He answered, "Do so, Doctor: it would be very comforting and desirable."

I used the "Office of the Visitation of the Sick" from the beginning to the end; adding the prayer for "A sick person when there appeareth but little hope of recovery."

The Bishop made every response audibly, while lying on his bed, with his hands clasped and eyes looking up to heaven.

Among the questions to be asked in the Examination of the Sick, are these, "Do you repent you truly of your sins? Are you in charity with all the world?" The Bishop closed his eyes while he spoke of himself as a sinner, both in thought, word, and deed; saying that "in his most earnest endeavors to live for Christ and the Church, as well as in exercising himself to have conscience void of offence towards God and towards man, he saw infirmity and pollution"—then, opening his eyes, he added, "But the holiest man, equally with the most sinful, finds, in the hour of death, that every hope on which he relies for salvation is dispersed, but ONE—all but ONE, our Saviour JESUS CHRIST—HE is the Rock of Ages." Then, looking me in the face, the Bishop said with solemn earnestness, "*Of the crimes of which I have been accused and for which I have been condemned, my conscience acquits me, in the sight of God.*"

In answer to the other questions, the Bishop expressed charity with all; forgiveness, from the bottom of his heart, of all persons that had offended him: readiness to ask forgiveness of all whom he had offended: and willingness to make amends, to the uttermost of his power, where he had done injury to any.

The Bishop received the final invocation and blessing, in the Visitation Office, with the meekness of a quiet spirit—then extending to me his emaciated hand and pressing mine, thanked me, with fervor, and said, "God bless you, my dear Doctor." And so we parted. Very truly your brother,

FRANCIS VINTON.

To the Rev. Samuel Seabury, D.D.

conversation, I could only ask him to unite with me in these and other parts of the same office. This he did with great composure and fervor of mind. It was not my privilege to see him again. Early the next day he expired.

Few men have passed through such a fight of afflictions, and had so many trials, so many opportunities to exemplify the highest graces of the Christian character* as our deceased father in God. To those of his clergy and people who have adhered to him through good and evil report, who have steadfastly believed in the unblemished purity of his character; or who believing that he had erred, loved him for the many beautiful traits which his sufferings developed, it is a matter of heartfelt satisfaction to believe that in him, as far as human eye can discern, patience, charity, and brotherly kindness had their perfect work. The graces and virtues brought out by his sufferings in his retirement from the world, no less than the extraordinary abilities displayed in the active duties of his eminent station, prove him to have been indeed "a burning and a shining light." They who do not appreciate his example, of course cannot imitate it. But let us who have rejoiced in his light be guided by it to Christ our Saviour; that copying the patience and humility, the faith and charity, the courage and constancy, and the noble and forgiving temper of our departed father, we may be preserved in the unity of the Church in this world, and admitted to the company of the blessed in the world to come, through Jesus Christ our only Saviour and Redeemer; to Whom in unity with the Father and the Holy Ghost be all glory now and forever! Amen.

* The concluding paragraph of the discourse has been suggested by a letter received from one of the best and ablest of our clergy, the Rev. Dr. Wm. Shelton, of Buffalo. Having referred to the example of our good Bishop, Dr. Shelton adds: "It is painful to me to be taken leave of (as I am) by most of my old friends. I helped to make him Bishop (by my vote), and he was my superior for some eight years; and in all my intercourse with him, he was always the same. He was very high-minded, and above vile things and arts; self-denying and self-sacrificing. I part with him as from one of the old land-marks which I have looked upon since my early manhood. He was Professor of History, etc., to my class, and was one of the gentlemen of that day who entertained society, as well as devoted himself to the discharge of clerical duties with devotion and ability. That I shall see him no more forever is a thought that thrills my heart, and fills me with a flood of emotions and remembrances."

Dr. Shelton, I trust, will pardon the liberty I have taken in sharing with the sorrowful friends and sincere admirers of our departed father, this just and genial tribute to his memory.

OBSEQUIES AND OBITUARY NOTICES

OF THE LATE RIGHT REVEREND

Benj. Credwell Onderdonk, D. D.,

BISHOP OF NEW-YORK,

AND OTHER DOCUMENTS.

~~~~~  
BY A NEW-YORK CHURCHMAN.  
~~~~~

4B²

New-York:
PUBLISHED BY H. B. PRICE.
884 BROADWAY.
1862.







Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process.
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: April 2006

PreservationTechnologies

A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111

42
5-77-5
③

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 523 174 2